

Measurements of the charm jet cross section and nuclear modification factor in pPb collisions at $\sqrt{s_{NN}} = 5.02$ TeV

Journal Article

Author(s):

CMS Collaboration; Sirunyan, Albert M.; Bachmair, Felix; Bäni, L.; Bianchini, Lorenzo; Casal, Bruno; Dissertori, Günther; Dittmar, Michael; Donegà, Mauro; Grab, Christoph; Heidegger, Constantin; Hits, Dmitry; Hoss, Jan; Kasieczka, Gregor; Lecomte, Pierre; Lustermaan, Werner; Mangano, Boris; Marionneau, Matthieu; Martinez Ruiz del Arbol, Pablo; Masciovecchio, Mario; Meinhard, Maren T.; Meister, Daniel; Micheli, Francesco; Musella, Pasquale; Nessi-Tedaldi, Francesca; Pandolfi, Francesco; Pata, Joosep; Pauss, Felicitas; Perrin, Gaël; Perrozzi, Luca; Quittnat, Milena; Rossini, Marco; Schönenberger, Myriam; Starodumov, Andrey; Tavoraro, Vittorio R.; Theofilatos, Konstantinos; Wallny, Rainer; et al.

Publication date:

2017-09-10

Permanent link:

<https://doi.org/10.3929/ethz-b-000211867>

Rights / license:

[Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International](#)

Originally published in:

Physics Letters B 772, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.physletb.2017.06.053>



Measurements of the charm jet cross section and nuclear modification factor in pPb collisions at $\sqrt{s_{NN}} = 5.02$ TeV



The CMS Collaboration*

CERN, Switzerland

ARTICLE INFO

Article history:

Received 28 December 2016
 Received in revised form 12 May 2017
 Accepted 19 June 2017
 Available online 23 June 2017
 Editor: M. Doser

Keywords:

CMS
 Heavy ions
 Charm-tagging
 Heavy-flavor

ABSTRACT

The CMS Collaboration presents the first measurement of the differential cross section of jets from charm quarks produced in proton–lead (pPb) collisions at a nucleon–nucleon center-of-mass energy of $\sqrt{s_{NN}} = 5.02$ TeV, as well as results from charm quark jets in proton–proton (pp) collisions at $\sqrt{s} = 2.76$ and 5.02 TeV. By comparing the yields of the pPb and pp collision systems at the same energy, a nuclear modification factor for charm jets from 55 to 400 GeV/c in pPb collisions at $\sqrt{s_{NN}} = 5.02$ TeV of $R_{pA} = 0.92 \pm 0.07$ (stat) ± 0.11 (syst) is obtained. This is consistent with an absence of final-state energy loss for charm quarks in pPb collisions. In addition, the fraction of jets coming from charm quarks is found to be consistent with that predicted by PYTHIA 6 for pp collisions at $\sqrt{s} = 2.76$ and 5.02 TeV, and is independent of the jet transverse momentum from 55 to 400 GeV/c.

© 2017 The Author(s). Published by Elsevier B.V. This is an open access article under the CC BY license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>). Funded by SCOAP³.

1. Introduction

The creation of a new state of matter, known as quark–gluon plasma (QGP), has been predicted by lattice calculations for states of matter with extremely high energy densities [1]. Collisions of heavy nuclei studied at both the BNL RHIC and CERN LHC facilities have been observed to create energy densities larger than that required for QGP creation [2–5]. The QGP is a state of matter which is characterized by an effective deconfinement of the quark and gluon color degrees of freedom. Hard-scattered partons are expected to lose energy via elastic and inelastic interactions as they traverse the QGP [6]. This is commonly thought to be the mechanism responsible for the observed suppression of high transverse momentum (p_T) hadrons and jets, or “jet quenching”, in nuclear collisions [2,7–13].

Jet quenching is expected to depend on the flavor of the fragmenting parton [14,15], primarily due to two effects: first, heavy quarks may suffer mass-dependent effects further separating their energy loss measurements from those of inclusive jets. For example, it is expected that the radiative and collisional energy loss mechanisms should have different strengths for heavy quark and light quark jets [16,17]. Therefore, heavy quarks can provide new information on the relative jet quenching power of these various energy loss mechanisms. Second, a pure heavy flavored jet sample does not generally contain jets seeded by high- p_T gluons, contrary

to a measurement of inclusive jets, which contains a sizable gluon-jet component as predicted by PYTHIA [18] simulations. Under the assumption that gluon radiation is the dominant mechanism for energy loss, gluon jets are expected to quench more strongly than quark jets, owing to the larger color factor for gluon emission from gluons than from quarks [19]. By identifying charm and bottom jets (c and b jets), measurements can be performed on a jet sample with an enhanced fraction of quark jets.

The energy loss discrimination power of both effects is mitigated somewhat due to the presence of gluon splitting, which is a next-to-leading order heavy quark production mechanism where a high-energy gluon can split into a quark pair. At high- p_T , the heavy flavored quark production fraction from gluon splitting is expected to be roughly 50% [20], but as the gluon virtuality is also quite large, it may be the case that the quarks from gluon splitting still experience the majority of the QGP medium evolution.

The CMS Collaboration has also previously observed QGP effects on heavy-flavored objects through measurements of fully-reconstructed mesons [21]. While meson measurements are able to access the low- p_T regime in a more effective way than jets, the measurements are less direct as a result of the fragmentation process. In other words, the connection to the b or c quark energy loss is smeared by its combination with a light quark to create the reconstructed object, whereas jets aim to capture the entire energy of the fragmenting quark.

Previous measurements of jets in proton–lead (pPb) collisions have not observed significant jet quenching effects [22–25], suggesting that measurements from pPb collisions can place limits on

* E-mail address: cms-publication-committee-chair@cern.ch.

the extent of “cold nuclear matter” effects on jet production [26]. One such initial-state effect is due to the nuclear parton distribution functions (nPDFs). These nPDFs are expected to enhance the charm quark yields by roughly 10–15%, as the kinematic selections used in this analysis correspond to the “antishadowing” region of the Bjorken- x distribution [27]. While the modification factors R_{pA} for both b jets [28] and inclusive jets [23] at a nucleon-nucleon center of mass energy of $\sqrt{s_{NN}} = 5.02$ TeV have been measured by CMS, these measurements used a PYTHIA simulation and an interpolated pp reference as baselines, respectively, as at the time of publication, no 5.02 TeV proton–proton (pp) data was available. This analysis presents the first measurement of an inclusive charm jet cross section in pPb collisions at $\sqrt{s_{NN}} = 5.02$ TeV, including comparisons to the cross sections in pp collisions at both $\sqrt{s} = 2.76$ and 5.02 TeV.

2. Detection, reconstruction, and simulation

2.1. Detection

The CMS detector has excellent capabilities to perform displaced jet identification (b and c tagging) as demonstrated in Ref. [29]. The central feature of the CMS apparatus is a superconducting solenoid of 6 m internal diameter, providing a magnetic field of 3.8 T. Within the solenoid volume are a silicon pixel and strip tracker, a lead tungstate crystal electromagnetic calorimeter, and a brass and scintillator hadron calorimeter (HCAL), each composed of a barrel and two endcap sections. Extensive forward calorimetry complements the coverage provided by the barrel and endcap detectors. The tracker has a pseudorapidity coverage of $|\eta_{lab}| < 2.4$, while the calorimetry covers $|\eta_{lab}| < 3$. Muons are measured in gas-ionization detectors embedded in the steel flux-return yoke outside the solenoid. A more detailed description of the CMS detector, together with a definition of the coordinate system used and the relevant kinematic variables, can be found in Ref. [30].

Event selections are identical to previous pPb analyses [23,28,31] and include the requirement of a primary vertex within 15 cm of the nominal interaction point in the beam direction and the removal of events consisting primarily of HCAL noise. Beam-related background is suppressed by rejecting events in which less than 25% of all reconstructed tracks are of good quality.

2.2. Reconstruction

Jets are reconstructed offline using the particle-flow algorithm [32], which identifies each individual jet constituent as one of a number of different particle types, including photons, electrons, muons, charged hadrons, and neutral hadrons. This is done using an optimized combination of information from the various elements of the CMS detector [33]. These particle-flow candidates do not have explicit kinematic selections, though charged tracks are limited to $p_T > 400$ MeV. Jets are clustered by the anti- k_T algorithm [34] with a radius of 0.3. Jet energy corrections are derived from simulation and using measurements of energy balance in dijet and photon+jet events. Finally, an iterative underlying event removal procedure is applied to jets in pPb events [35]. Jet momentum is found from simulation to be within 2% of the true jet momentum over the whole p_T spectrum and detector acceptance after the jet energy corrections are applied for both pp and pPb collisions. This residual nonclosure is primarily due to differing jet energy resolution between quark and gluon jets.

Three different data sets collected by the CMS experiment are used, corresponding to integrated luminosities of 35 nb⁻¹ of pPb collisions at $\sqrt{s_{NN}} = 5.02$ TeV and 4.8 pb⁻¹ of pp collisions at

$\sqrt{s} = 2.76$ TeV taken during the 2013 heavy ion run period at the LHC, as well as 27.9 pb⁻¹ of pp collisions at $\sqrt{s} = 5.02$ TeV collected during the 2015 heavy ion run period. During the pPb run, the proton and lead beam energies per nucleon were different, which led to a center-of-mass pseudorapidity (η) shift of 0.465 units with respect to the laboratory frame. After an integrated luminosity of 20.9 nb⁻¹ was collected, the directions of the proton and lead beams were reversed. In this analysis, the beam parameters are redefined such that the proton beam is always traveling in the positive η direction. Therefore, the laboratory and the center-of-mass pseudorapidities are related as $\eta_{lab} = \eta_{CM} + 0.465$.

As jet energy corrections are only reliable for $p_T > 20$ GeV/c, single jets are required to have a raw online p_T above that cut-off and a fully-corrected $p_T > 35$ GeV/c. In order to mitigate effects from the limited CMS inner tracker η acceptance of $|\eta_{lab}| < 2.4$ and the boost between the lab and center-of-mass reference frames, jets in pPb collisions are required to be reconstructed within $|\eta_{CM}| < 1.5$, while jets in pp collisions can be found within $|\eta_{CM}| < 2.0$. When direct comparisons of quantities in pp and pPb collisions are shown, jets from both systems use a pseudorapidity selection of $|\eta_{CM}| < 1.5$.

Events are selected online by one or more jet triggers with varying energy thresholds. In the 2.76 TeV pp and 5.02 TeV pPb analysis, five single-jet triggers with p_T thresholds of 20, 40, 60, 80, and 100 GeV/c are combined in order to maximize the number of accepted events over a wide range of jet p_T . As some lower p_T triggers are prescaled, meaning that a fraction of the triggered events are randomly rejected to constrain data throughput, a simple OR of all triggers will bias the jet p_T spectrum toward the larger threshold triggers and will also have significant event duplication. Instead, a trigger combination procedure based on the trigger prescale factors is used. This trigger combination is also used in the analysis of b jets in pPb [28] and is briefly described here. The jet with the largest online raw p_T , i.e. the p_T used by the triggers before jet energy corrections, is used to classify each event. Based on this online raw jet p_T , it is possible to deduce which triggers have been satisfied, irrespective of whether a trigger is prescaled. If the highest fired trigger conditions are satisfied, the event is kept and weighted by the corresponding trigger prescale factor, else the event is discarded. After this combination, the jet finding efficiency of the full sample is >99.9% for jets above 35 GeV/c, and the total event selection efficiency is around 97%.

For the 5.02 TeV pp data, the trigger menu was slightly altered in preparation for the higher instantaneous luminosity achieved in the 2015 run period, so only four triggers are combined with p_T thresholds of 40, 60, 80, and 100 GeV/c. As a result of jet energy smearing effects from reconstruction and resolution unfolding, the absence of a 20 GeV/c trigger effectively places a 55 GeV/c lower bound on the leading jet p_T for the 5.02 TeV pp data, rather than the roughly 40 GeV/c bound at 2.76 TeV.

2.3. Simulation

This analysis relies on simulations of pp collisions at 2.76 and 5.02 TeV, as well as simulations of pPb collisions at 5.02 TeV. Monte Carlo (MC) simulations of inclusive quantum chromodynamic (QCD) hard-scattering events are generated using PYTHIA 6.424 [18], tune Z2 [36]. These events are generated imposing thresholds on the transverse momentum of the hard scattering subprocess (\hat{p}_T) in order to force production of jets with high p_T . In order to properly build templates, unfold the jet resolution, and calculate the tagging efficiency in the proton-nucleus environment, minimum-bias pPb events are produced using the HIJING 1.383 event generator [37] at $\sqrt{s_{NN}} = 5.02$ TeV. Simulated events from PYTHIA 6 are produced at 5.02 TeV in conjunction with a pPb back-




Fig. 1. Efficiency of tagging b jets (left) and light parton jets (right) for the high-purity (3+ track), and high-efficiency (2+ track) versions of the simple secondary vertex (SSV) tagger as a function of c jet tagging efficiency. The charm-to-bottom discrimination power is virtually unchanged between the high-efficiency and high-purity versions of the tagger, while the light parton jet mistag rate is reduced by a factor of three at the analysis working point, shown as the closed red cross on the plots. (For interpretation of the references to color in this figure, the reader is referred to the web version of this article.)

ground event. In this way, each simulated pPb event contains at least one jet produced by a hard scattering subprocess while still accurately representing the jet resolution and energy scale in a pPb environment. To account for possible differences in reconstruction performance between the two boost directions, MC samples were obtained for both directions of the proton beam. For pp collisions, η_{lab} is identical to η_{CM} . Jets generated by the HIJING simulation of the underlying pPb events are rejected in the analysis since these jets can be quenched [37], possibly resulting in a modified fragmentation pattern which would bias the jet energy corrections. Within the kinematic selections of the analysis, the jets from HIJING account for less than 1% of the total jet fraction.

3. Charm quark tagging

In Monte Carlo studies, a charm jet is defined as any jet containing a prompt charm quark within the jet cone and ignoring jets which contain a $b \rightarrow c$ cascade decay. Identification of such jets is achieved by tagging vertices consistent with decays of hadrons containing a charm quark. Even though the maximum displacement of such charmed hadron decays is only on the order of $100 \mu\text{m}$ for the kinematic selections of this analysis, the presence of a silicon tracker very close to the interaction point at CMS allows for the discrimination of secondary vertices with such small displacement values. For proton–proton collisions, individual track vertexing uncertainties in the beam direction are on the order of $100 \mu\text{m}$ at $1 \text{ GeV}/c$ and $40 \mu\text{m}$ at $10 \text{ GeV}/c$, while the uncertainties in the transverse direction are on the order of $70 \mu\text{m}$ at $1 \text{ GeV}/c$ and $20 \mu\text{m}$ at $10 \text{ GeV}/c$ [38].

This c jet analysis closely follows previous CMS analysis strategies for heavy-flavor jet identification, or tagging, specifically the measurements of b quark jets in heavy ion environments in CMS, both in lead–lead collisions [39] and pPb collisions [28]. This analysis strategy uses two different taggers to identify c jets. While both taggers assign a numerical discriminator quantifying how “charm like” each jet is, each tagger uses a slightly different identification strategy. The first tagger is known as the simple secondary vertex (SSV) tagger [29] and uses reconstructed displaced vertices. The version of the SSV tagger used in this analysis is the “high-purity” (SSVHP) one, which requires the presence of a secondary vertex in the jet cone with at least three associated tracks, each with track $p_T > 1 \text{ GeV}/c$. All versions require that all secondary vertices share fewer than 20% of tracks with any other vertex. The inclusion of

the third associated vertex track in the high-purity version of the tagger allows for the selection of a tagging working point that reduces the misidentification rate of light jets by a factor of three, while still keeping a large majority of c jets, as shown in Fig. 1. With a reduced light jet contamination, c jets begin to dominate small regions of kinematic phase space, which this analysis exploits to extract relative flavor contributions of light, c, and b jets to the total jet sample.

The second tagger used in this analysis is known as the jet probability (JP) tagger [29], and is used to cross-check the tagging efficiency predicted by simulation using control samples in data. This tagger uses a numerical discriminator based on the presence of single tracks that are significantly displaced from the primary vertex, and is therefore largely uncorrelated with secondary vertex reconstruction performance. The efficiency of a particular tagger (e.g. SSVHP) can be calculated with the JP tagger:

$$\epsilon_{\text{tag}} = \frac{C_c f_c^{\text{tagged}} N_{\text{jets}}^{\text{tagged}}}{f_c^{\text{pretag}} N_{\text{jets}}^{\text{pretag}}}, \quad (1)$$

where f_c^{tagged} is the purity of the sample from a JP discriminator template fit after applying the SSVHP discriminator selection, and f_c^{pretag} is the same but before this selection, $N_{\text{jets}}^{\text{pretag}}$ and $N_{\text{jets}}^{\text{tagged}}$ denote the number of jets before and after tagging, respectively, and C_c denotes the fraction of jets that can be identified by the JP tagger (generally very close to one).

The tagging efficiency is calculated both from simulation and using distributions of the JP tagger [29] both before and after imposing the SSVHP tagging requirement. A unique advantage of using the JP tagger for calculating tagging efficiency via Eq. (1) is that it can be calibrated using data to correct for the effects of tracking resolution. Tracks with negative values of impact parameter significance (i.e. tracks with vertex displacements on the away-side of the vertex from the jet) are purely a product of resolution smearing and these can be used to compute a probability for the association of any given track to the primary vertex. The tagger distributions are calibrated independently in data and simulation such that the distribution of negative impact parameters is flat (by construction) as a function of track displacement. Through the calibration of the JP tagger, the impact parameter significance distributions in both data and simulation are transformed from unbounded into bounded distributions, such that both can be analyzed on an equal footing. Once recalibrated, the residual difference

between the tagging efficiency derived from simulation and from the JP calculation (Eq. (1)) is used as the systematic uncertainty estimation.

The c jet purity calculation relies on another discriminating variable known as the corrected secondary vertex mass. This was first developed as a tool for identifying b jets by the experiments at LEP [40] and SLC [41] and is also used by the LHCb Collaboration [42]. The motivation behind this variable is to correct for any missing mass of the decay vertex due to neutral or unobserved particles. If the momentum vector of the collection of particles associated to a vertex is not parallel to the vector pointing from the primary vertex to the secondary vertex decay point, i.e. the flight direction of the constituent particles, one can use conservation of momentum to calculate a minimum possible mass the vertex must have had. This minimum possible mass is called the corrected secondary vertex mass, or M_{corr} , and is defined as:

$$M_{\text{corr}} = \sqrt{M^2 + (p/c)^2 \sin^2 \theta + (p/c) \sin \theta}, \quad (2)$$

where M is the invariant mass of the vertex, p is the momentum of the vector sum of the reconstructed particles that form the secondary vertex, and θ is defined as the angle between that summed momentum vector and the flight direction of the vertex. If all particles that belong to a given secondary vertex are reconstructed, the angle θ should be zero, and the secondary vertex mass needs no correction. Otherwise, the value of M_{corr} is used in the calculation of the vertex mass to account for the nonreconstructed momentum.

The c jet purity is found using template fits of M_{corr} , after using the SSVHP tagger. The numerical values of the SSVHP discriminator are correlated to the significance of the secondary vertex displacement with respect to the primary vertex and are obtained using the formula: $\text{SSVHP} = \ln(1 + |d|/\sigma(d))$, where d is the three-dimensional vertex displacement and $\sigma(d)$ is the uncertainty in the displacement measurement. The working point used in this analysis requires $\text{SSVHP} > 1.68$, which maximizes the estimated c jet purity from the MC samples, increasing the c jet purity from around 10% to around 30%. Once the working point selection is applied to the sample, distributions of corrected secondary vertex mass from light parton, c , and b jets in the PYTHIA+HIJING or PYTHIA simulations are fit to distributions in data. The shapes of the different flavor templates are fixed, but the relative normalizations of each flavor template are allowed to float independently. As seen in Fig. 2 for pPb collisions, and in Fig. 3 for pp collisions at 5.02 TeV, b jets dominate the M_{corr} distributions for vertex masses above 3 GeV/c^2 , while the light parton jet contribution is significantly reduced by the SSVHP tagger requirement. Because of this light parton jet removal, the relative c jet contribution to the sample below 3 GeV/c^2 is quite large, allowing for an accurate extraction of the c jet purity in the data sample.

Fig. 4 shows the c tagging purity and efficiency of the sample after applying the SSVHP tagger selection for 5.02 TeV pPb collisions, both in data and simulation. Fig. 5 depicts the same for 5.02 and 2.76 TeV pp collisions, again, both in data and simulation.

Once the efficiency and purity values are found, the total number of c jets in the sample is obtained p_T bin by p_T bin using:

$$N_{c \text{ jets}} = N_{\text{jets}}^{\text{tagged}} \frac{f_c}{\epsilon_{\text{tag}}}, \quad (3)$$

where $N_{\text{jets}}^{\text{tagged}}$ is the number of jets passing the SSVHP working point selection, f_c is again the c jet tagging purity, and ϵ_{tag} is the tagging efficiency. After correcting for tagging efficiency and purity, the c jet p_T spectrum is obtained. This spectrum is then passed




Fig. 2. Corrected secondary vertex mass distributions from PYTHIA+HIJING for c jets (green), light parton jets (blue), and b jets (red) in the jet p_T range 55–80 GeV/c (upper) and 120–170 GeV/c (lower). Relative normalizations of these three distributions are fit to a distribution from pPb collision data (black). Statistical uncertainties are shown in black for data and for individual simulated flavor components and are shown in blue for the sum of the simulated distributions. The bottom panels of both plots show the ratio of data to simulation. (For interpretation of the colors in this figure, the reader is referred to the web version of this article.)

through a singular value decomposition (SVD) [43] unfolding procedure, as implemented by the RooUnfold [44] package to remove the jet resolution effects.

4. Systematic uncertainties and cross checks

Systematic uncertainties for this analysis are divided into two primary categories: charm tagging and jet reconstruction.

4.1. Tagging systematic uncertainties

A number of systematic checks on the charm-tagged spectrum are considered, including varying the SSVHP working point, calculating the c tagging efficiency using the JP tagger method instead of obtaining the value from simulation, varying the gluon splitting fraction in the MC sample, varying the MC templates within their statistical uncertainties, and finally reweighting and varying the D meson decay parameters within the uncertainties of the world average in the simulation [45].

The tagger working point is varied over the discriminator working point region where the use of a discriminator enhances the c




Fig. 3. Corrected secondary vertex mass from a PYTHIA 6, tune Z2 simulation for c jets (green), light parton jets (blue) and b jets (red) in the jet p_T range 55–80 GeV/c (upper) and 120–170 GeV/c (lower). Relative normalizations of these three distributions are fit to a distribution from pp collision data (black). Statistical uncertainties are shown in black for data and for individual simulated flavor components and are shown in blue for the sum of the simulated distributions. The bottom panels of both plots show the ratio of data to simulation. (For interpretation of the colors in this figure, the reader is referred to the web version of this article.)

jet purity. With a very loose discriminator selection, the c jet purity is slightly enhanced relative to an unbiased sample, while a very tight selection removes the great majority of both light parton and c jets such that the b jets dominate the sample. There is a narrow window in which the c jet purity is larger than in an unbiased sample, corresponding to the SSVHP discriminator values between 1.2 and 2.4. At its peak, the SSVHP tagger enhances the c jet purity from around 10% to around 30%. To test the stability of the SSVHP tagger, multiple template fits to the corrected secondary vertex mass are performed, varying the working point of the tagger in steps of 0.2 units over this range and calculating the effective standard deviation from all working point variations. This leads to a 2–5% uncertainty, depending on jet p_T . An uncertainty is derived from the difference between the tagging efficiency as obtained from simulation and via fits to the JP tagger discriminator from Eq. (1). The differences in tagging efficiency between the PYTHIA 6 estimation and using the JP tagger stem primarily from statistical fluctuation in the templates, along with a slight effect from a polynomial smoothing of these uncertainties as a function of p_T . These differences introduce a 5–15% uncertainty, also as a function of p_T .




Fig. 4. Tagging purity (upper) and efficiency (lower) for the working point selection of SSVHP > 1.68 in pPb collisions at 5.02 TeV for simulation (open red squares) and data (closed black points). (For interpretation of the references to color in this figure, the reader is referred to the web version of this article.)

One of the primary theoretical unknowns in heavy-flavor jets is the impact of higher-order corrections, such as gluon splitting, and how these effects manifest themselves in these fits. To account for this, the gluon splitting fraction in simulation is varied by 50% up or down and the distributions of corrected secondary vertex mass are refit to the modified MC templates, where both $g \rightarrow c\bar{c}$ and $g \rightarrow b\bar{b}$ splitting events are considered. The numerical value of 50% is used to cover observed discrepancies across various MC generators as well as discrepancies of MC generators to data, though these are primarily driven by b jet studies, where data is available. The PYTHIA 6 generator shows a gluon splitting contribution of about 35%, whereas the PYTHIA 8 generator shows a much larger contribution of around 60% [16]. Furthermore, measurements of b-dijet angular correlations in 7 TeV pp collisions show significant deviation between data and simulation as well as across generators for small dijet angular separation (ΔR) values, where gluon splitting effects dominate [46]. It is assumed that gluon splitting effects are as uncertain for c jets as they are for b jets. Overall, systematic uncertainty from the variation of the gluon splitting contribution is an appreciable effect in both pPb and pp collisions, though less than 15%.

The template statistical uncertainty is accounted for by varying the distributions of light parton, c, and b jets from MC within their statistical uncertainties using a parametric MC study. The uncertainty is estimated by fitting a Gaussian distribution to the fluctuations in purity, where the Gaussian width is used as the un-




Fig. 5. The tagging purity (upper) and efficiency (lower) for the working point selection of $SSVHP > 1.68$ in pp collisions at 5.02 TeV (square markers) and at 2.76 TeV (circular markers). Purity curves from simulation (open red markers) and data (closed markers) are shown, obtained by fitting templates to the data. The lower plot shows efficiency curves from simulation (open red markers) and the cross-check based on JP tagging. (For interpretation of the references to color in this figure, the reader is referred to the web version of this article.)

certainty value. These values are p_T -dependent, ranging from 5% at intermediate p_T to around 10% at low (≈ 60 GeV/c) and high p_T (≈ 300 GeV/c).

This analysis accounts for the possibility that the PYTHIA simulation does not accurately reproduce the D meson decay kinematics. Since a secondary vertex that corresponds to a decay involving at least three particles is required in order to tag jets, the influence of the D meson decay parameters is studied by reweighting both the relative charm quark fragmentation and the successive D meson decay parameters in simulation to match the world average values from previous experiments. We find that reweighting and varying these values within their uncertainties leads to a 5.5% effect, independent of the jet p_T , collision species, and collision energy.

The contributions from each source of systematic uncertainty are summed in quadrature to obtain an overall systematic uncertainty from c jet tagging. When summed, these tagging uncertainties lead to a 10–12% uncertainty on the fraction of charm quark jets (c jet fraction) in pp collisions, and a 10–20% uncertainty in pPb collisions, where the majority of the extra uncertainty in pPb relative to pp comes from the JP-tagger calibration and additional unavoidable coupling of statistical fluctuations in data to the systematic uncertainty calculation at high- p_T .




Fig. 6. The c jet cross sections (upper panels) and fraction (lower panels) as a function of c jet p_T for 5.02 TeV (top figure) and 2.76 TeV pp data (bottom figure), compared to predictions from PYTHIA 6. Systematic uncertainties are shown as filled boxes.

4.2. Jet reconstruction systematic uncertainties

Additional uncertainties stem from jet reconstruction. Jet energy corrections are derived from simulation and via energy balance measurements using photon+jet events. The residual non-closure of the corrections leads to a jet energy scale uncertainty ranging from 2–3%, depending on p_T and η . In addition, the effect of jet resolution is calculated by first smearing MC jets to match distributions of jet resolution in data, and then by using a parameterized MC study, which leads to an uncertainty of about 5%. The SVD unfolding procedure is cross-checked by comparing to alternative unfolding methods, including D’Agostini’s method [47], and by varying the raw simulated spectrum, known as the “truth” spectrum. The uncertainty on the unfolding procedure is around 5%, while a 4% uncertainty is found for the simulation of the “truth” spectrum shape. Together, all these reconstruction-based uncertainties are added in quadrature and total between 12–15% in pPb collisions and around 15% in pp collisions. Finally, the integrated luminosity measurement of the pPb data has an uncertainty of 3.6%, while the corresponding uncertainties in pp data at 2.76 and 5 TeV are 3.7 and 3.6%, respectively. As the uncertainties from the jet energy resolution, luminosity, unfolding, and the “truth” spectrum are canceled in the c jet fraction measurement, they are applied only to the cross section measurement.




Fig. 7. The c jet cross section (upper panel) and R_{pA} (lower panel) as a function of c jet p_T for 5.02 TeV pPb and pp data. Statistical uncertainties are solid black lines, while systematic uncertainties are shown as filled colored boxes. Integrated luminosity uncertainties for pp and pPb data are shown as filled boxes around unity.

5. Results

The c jet p_T cross section in pp collisions are shown in Fig. 6 for 5.02 TeV (upper) and 2.76 TeV (lower) collisions. The data are corrected for jet resolution by a singular value decomposition (SVD) unfolding procedure. Both cross sections are compared to predictions from the Z2 tune of PYTHIA 6. The bottom panels of Fig. 6 show the c jet fraction, that is, the total number of charm jets relative to the number of inclusive jets, in pp for both collision energies. A comparison of the c jet fractions at 2.76 and 5.02 TeV suggests that the collision energy dependence of the c jet fraction is small if any and the two measurements are consistent with each other within systematic uncertainties. In addition, data from both energies confirm the PYTHIA predictions.

The c jet cross sections as functions of p_T are shown in the upper panel of Fig. 7 for pPb and pp collisions at 5.02 TeV. The cross sections are normalized by the total integrated luminosity of the sample. The pPb c jet cross section is also scaled by the mass number of lead ($A = 208$) which normalizes the pPb measurement per binary nucleon–nucleon collision, as predicted by the Glauber model [48,49]. This additional scaling allows for a direct comparison of the pPb data to the pp data at the same center-of-mass energy. The direct comparison is known as the R_{pA} value, which is defined as:

$$R_{pA} = \frac{1}{A} \frac{d\sigma^{pPb}/dp_T}{d\sigma^{pp}/dp_T}. \quad (4)$$

In the lower panel of Fig. 7, the c jet R_{pA} value is calculated at 5.02 TeV. We observe R_{pA} values consistent with unity for all p_T bins, suggesting that initial state nuclear modification effects are small for c jets at large p_T , confirming perturbative QCD predictions indicating such behavior. This absence of initial state effects is consistent with similar CMS observations for b and inclusive jets [23,28]. Fitting a constant to the pPb c jet R_{pA} p_T distribution yields $R_{pA} = 0.92 \pm 0.07$ (stat) ± 0.11 (syst).

6. Summary

The transverse momentum differential cross section for c jets has been obtained for pPb collisions at $\sqrt{s_{NN}} = 5.02$ TeV, as well as for pp collisions at $\sqrt{s} = 2.76$ and 5.02 TeV. The c jet fraction of $\approx 6\%$ is consistent with PYTHIA simulations for pp collisions at both center-of-mass energies. By comparing the cross sec-

tions for pPb and pp collisions, a p_T -independent R_{pA} value of 0.92 ± 0.07 (stat) ± 0.11 (syst) is observed for c jets at 5.02 TeV, indicating that no significant jet energy modification is present in pPb collisions for c jets with $p_T > 55$ GeV/c. These measurements indicate that proton–lead initial state effects on c jets between 55–400 GeV/c are small and that charm jet quenching in lead–lead collisions should not be influenced by such effects.

Acknowledgements

We congratulate our colleagues in the CERN accelerator departments for the excellent performance of the LHC and thank the technical and administrative staffs at CERN and at other CMS institutes for their contributions to the success of the CMS effort. In addition, we gratefully acknowledge the computing centers and personnel of the Worldwide LHC Computing Grid for delivering so effectively the computing infrastructure essential to our analyses. Finally, we acknowledge the enduring support for the construction and operation of the LHC and the CMS detector provided by the following funding agencies:

BMWFW and FWF (Austria); FNRS and FWO (Belgium); CNPq, CAPES, FAPERJ, and FAPESP (Brazil); MES (Bulgaria); CERN; CAS, Ministry of Science and Technology of the People’s Republic of China, and NSFC (China); COLCIENCIAS (Colombia); MSES and CSF (Croatia); RPF (Cyprus); SENESCYT (Ecuador); MoER, ERC IUT, and ERDF (Estonia); Academy of Finland, MEC, and HIP (Finland); CEA and CNRS/IN2P3 (France); BMBF, DFG, and HGF (Germany); GSRT (Greece); OTKA and NIH (Hungary); DAE and DST (India); IPM (Iran); SFI (Ireland); INFN (Italy); MSIP and NRF (Republic of Korea); LAS (Lithuania); MOE and UM (Malaysia); BUAP, CINVESTAV, CONACYT, LNS, SEP, and UASLP-FAI (Mexico); MBIE (New Zealand); PAEC (Pakistan); MSHE and NSC (Poland); FCT (Portugal); JINR (Dubna), MON, ROSATOM, RAS, RFBR and RAEP (Russia); MESTD (Serbia); SEIDI and CPAN (Spain); Swiss Funding Agencies (Switzerland); MST (Taipei); ThEPCenter, IPST, STAR, and NSTDA (Thailand); TUBITAK and TAEK (Turkey); NASU and SFFR (Ukraine); STFC (United Kingdom); DOE and NSF (USA).

Individuals have received support from the Marie-Curie program and the European Research Council and EPLANET (European Union); the Leventis Foundation; the A. P. Sloan Foundation; the Alexander von Humboldt Foundation; the Belgian Federal Science Policy Office; the Fonds pour la Formation à la Recherche dans l’Industrie et dans l’Agriculture (FRIA-Belgium); the Agentschap voor Innovatie door Wetenschap en Technologie (IWT-Belgium); the Ministry of Education, Youth and Sports (MEYS) of the Czech Republic; the Council of Science and Industrial Research, India; the HOMING PLUS program of the Foundation for Polish Science, cofinanced from European Union, Regional Development Fund, the Mobility Plus program of the Ministry of Science and Higher Education, the National Science Center (Poland), contracts Harmonia 2014/14/M/ST2/00428, Opus 2014/13/B/ST2/02543, 2014/15/B/ST2/03998, and 2015/19/B/ST2/02861, Sonata-bis 2012/07/E/ST2/01406; the Thalís and Aristeia programs cofinanced by EU-ESF and the Greek NSRF; the National Priorities Research Program by Qatar National Research Fund; the Programa Clarín-COFUND del Principado de Asturias; the Rachadapisek Sompot Fund for Postdoctoral Fellowship, Chulalongkorn University and the Chulalongkorn Academic into Its 2nd Century Project Advancement Project (Thailand); and the Welch Foundation, contract C-1845.

References

- [1] F. Karsch, Lattice results on QCD thermodynamics, Nucl. Phys. A 698 (2002) 199, [http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0375-9474\(01\)01365-3](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0375-9474(01)01365-3), arXiv:hep-ph/0103314.

- [2] J. Adams, et al., STAR, Experimental and theoretical challenges in the search for the quark gluon plasma: the STAR collaboration's critical assessment of the evidence from RHIC collisions, *Nucl. Phys. A* 757 (2005) 102, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.nuclphysa.2005.03.085>, arXiv:nucl-ex/0501009.
- [3] B.W. Berndt Muller, Jurgen Schukraft, First results from Pb + Pb collisions at the LHC, *Annu. Rev. Nucl. Part. Sci.* 62 (2012) 361, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1146/annurev-nucl-102711-094910>, arXiv:1202.3233.
- [4] CMS Collaboration, Measurement of the pseudorapidity and centrality dependence of the transverse energy density in PbPb collisions at $\sqrt{s_{NN}} = 2.76$ TeV, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 109 (2012) 152303, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevLett.109.152303>.
- [5] A. Adare, et al., PHENIX, Transverse energy production and charged-particle multiplicity at midrapidity in various systems from $\sqrt{s_{NN}} = 7.7$ to 200 GeV, *Phys. Rev. C* 93 (2016) 024901, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevC.93.024901>, arXiv:1509.06727.
- [6] J.D. Bjorken, Energy loss of energetic partons in QGP: possible extinction of high p_T jets in hadron-hadron collisions, FERMILAB-PUB-82-059-THY, <http://lss.fnal.gov/archive/1982/pub/Pub-82-059-T.pdf>, 1982.
- [7] K. Adcox, et al., PHENIX, Formation of dense partonic matter in relativistic nucleus nucleus collisions at RHIC: experimental evaluation by the PHENIX collaboration, *Nucl. Phys. A* 757 (2005) 184, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.nuclphysa.2005.03.086>, arXiv:nucl-ex/0410003.
- [8] B.B. Back, et al., PHOBOS, The PHOBOS perspective on discoveries at RHIC, *Nucl. Phys. A* 757 (2005) 28, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.nuclphysa.2005.03.084>, arXiv:nucl-ex/0410022.
- [9] I. Arsene, et al., BRAHMS, Quark gluon plasma and color glass condensate at RHIC? The perspective from the BRAHMS experiment, *Nucl. Phys. A* 757 (2005) 1, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.nuclphysa.2005.02.130>, arXiv:nucl-ex/0410020.
- [10] CMS Collaboration, Observation and studies of jet quenching in PbPb collisions at nucleon-nucleon center-of-mass energy = 2.76 TeV, *Phys. Rev. C* 84 (2011) 024906, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevC.84.024906>, arXiv:1102.1957.
- [11] ATLAS Collaboration, Observation of a centrality-dependent dijet asymmetry in lead-lead collisions at $\sqrt{s_{NN}} = 2.76$ TeV with the ATLAS detector at the LHC, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 105 (2010) 252303, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevLett.105.252303>, arXiv:1011.6182.
- [12] ALICE Collaboration, Measurement of charged jet suppression in Pb-Pb collisions at $\sqrt{s_{NN}} = 2.76$ TeV, *J. High Energy Phys.* 30 (2014) 013, [http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/JHEP03\(2014\)013](http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/JHEP03(2014)013), arXiv:1311.0633.
- [13] ALICE Collaboration, Centrality dependence of charged jet production in p-Pb collisions at $\sqrt{s_{NN}} = 5.02$ TeV, *Phys. J. C* 76 (2016) 271, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1140/epjc/s10052-016-4107-8>, arXiv:1603.03402.
- [14] H. van Hees, R. Rapp, Thermalization of heavy quarks in the quark-gluon plasma, *Phys. Rev. C* 71 (2005) 034907, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevC.71.034907>, arXiv:nucl-th/0412015.
- [15] G.D. Moore, D. Teaney, How much do heavy quarks thermalize in a heavy ion collision?, *Phys. Rev. C* 71 (2005) 064904, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevC.71.064904>, arXiv:hep-ph/0412346.
- [16] J. Huang, Z.B. Kang, I. Vitev, Inclusive b-jet production in heavy ion collisions at the LHC, *Phys. Lett. B* 726 (2013) 251, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.physletb.2013.08.009>, arXiv:1306.0909.
- [17] Y.L. Dokshitzer, D.E. Kharzeev, Heavy quark calorimetry of QCD matter, *Phys. Lett. B* 519 (2001) 199, [http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0370-2693\(01\)01130-3](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0370-2693(01)01130-3), arXiv:hep-ph/0106202.
- [18] T. Sjöstrand, S. Mrenna, P. Skands, PYTHIA 6.4 physics and manual, *J. High Energy Phys.* 05 (2006) 026, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1088/1126-6708/2006/05/026>, arXiv:hep-ph/0603175.
- [19] D. d'Enterria, *Jet Quenching*, Springer Materials, 2010, arXiv:0902.2011.
- [20] A. Banfi, G.P. Salam, G. Zanderighi, Accurate QCD predictions for heavy-quark jets at the Tevatron and LHC, *J. High Energy Phys.* 07 (2007) 026, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1088/1126-6708/2007/07/026>, arXiv:0704.2999.
- [21] CMS Collaboration, Study of B meson production in p + Pb collisions at $\sqrt{s_{NN}} = 5.02$ TeV using exclusive hadronic decays, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 116 (2016) 032301, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevLett.116.032301>, arXiv:1508.06678.
- [22] CMS Collaboration, Studies of dijet transverse momentum balance and pseudorapidity distributions in pPb collisions at $\sqrt{s_{NN}} = 5.02$ TeV, *Eur. Phys. J. C* 74 (2014) 2951, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1140/epjc/s10052-014-2951-y>.
- [23] CMS Collaboration, Measurement of inclusive jet nuclear modification factor in pPb collisions at $\sqrt{s_{NN}} = 5.02$ TeV, *Eur. Phys. J. C* 76 (2016) 372, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1140/epjc/s10052-016-4205-7>, arXiv:1601.02001.
- [24] ATLAS Collaboration, Centrality and rapidity dependence of inclusive jet production in $\sqrt{s_{NN}} = 5.02$ TeV proton-lead collisions with the ATLAS detector, *Phys. Lett. B* 748 (2015) 392, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.physletb.2015.07.023>, arXiv:1412.4092.
- [25] ALICE Collaboration, Measurement of charged jet production cross sections and nuclear modification in p-Pb collisions at $\sqrt{s_{NN}} = 5.02$ TeV, *Phys. Lett. B* 749 (2015) 68, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.physletb.2015.07.054>, arXiv:1503.00681.
- [26] C.A. Salgado, et al., Proton-nucleus collisions at the LHC: scientific opportunities and requirements, *J. Phys. G* 39 (2012) 015010, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1088/0954-3899/39/1/015010>, arXiv:1105.3919.
- [27] K. Eskola, P. Paakkinen, H. Paukkunen, C. Salgado, EPPS16: nuclear parton distributions with LHC data, *Eur. Phys. J. C* 77 (2017) 163, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1140/epjc/s10052-017-4725-9>, arXiv:1612.05741.
- [28] CMS Collaboration, Transverse momentum spectra of b jets in pPb collisions at $\sqrt{s_{NN}} = 5.02$ TeV, *Phys. Lett. B* 754 (2016) 59, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.physletb.2016.01.010>, arXiv:1510.03373.
- [29] CMS Collaboration, Identification of b-quark jets with the CMS experiment, *J. Instrum.* 8 (2013) P04013, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1088/1748-0221/8/04/P04013>, arXiv:1211.4462.
- [30] CMS Collaboration, The CMS experiment at the CERN LHC, *J. Instrum.* 3 (2008) S08004, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1088/1748-0221/3/08/S08004>.
- [31] CMS Collaboration, Nuclear effects on the transverse momentum spectra of charged particles in pPb collisions at $\sqrt{s_{NN}} = 5.02$ TeV, *Eur. Phys. J. C* 75 (2015) 237, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1140/epjc/s10052-015-3435-4>.
- [32] CMS Collaboration, Commissioning of the particle-flow event reconstruction with the first LHC collisions recorded in the CMS detector, CMS Physics Analysis Summary CMS-PAS-PFT-10-001 2010, <http://cdsweb.cern.ch/record/1247373>.
- [33] CMS Collaboration, Particle-flow event reconstruction in CMS and performance for jets, taus, and E_T^{miss} , <http://cdsweb.cern.ch/record/1194487>, 2009, CMS-PAS-PFT-09-001.
- [34] M. Cacciari, G.P. Salam, G. Soyez, The anti- k_t jet clustering algorithm, *J. High Energy Phys.* 04 (2008) 063, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1088/1126-6708/2008/04/063>, arXiv:0802.1189.
- [35] O. Kodolova, I. Vardanyan, A. Nikitenko, A. Oulianov, The performance of the jet identification and reconstruction of heavy ions collisions with CMS detector, *Eur. Phys. J. C* 50 (2007) 115, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1140/epjc/s10052-007-0223-9>.
- [36] R. Field, Min-bias and the underlying event at the LHC, *Acta Phys. Pol. B* 42 (2011) 2631, <http://dx.doi.org/10.5506/APhysPolB.42.2631>, arXiv:1110.5530.
- [37] X.-N. Wang, M. Gyulassy, HIJING: a Monte Carlo program for parton and particle production in high energy hadronic and nuclear collisions, *Comput. Phys. Commun.* 83 (1994) 307, [http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/0010-4655\(94\)90057-4](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/0010-4655(94)90057-4), arXiv:nucl-th/9502021.
- [38] CMS Collaboration, Description and performance of track and primary-vertex reconstruction with the CMS tracker, *J. Instrum.* 9 (2014) P10009, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1088/1748-0221/9/10/P10009>, arXiv:1405.6569.
- [39] CMS Collaboration, Evidence of b-jet quenching in PbPb collisions at $\sqrt{s_{NN}} = 2.76$ TeV, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 113 (2014) 132301, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevLett.113.132301>.
- [40] G.J. Barker, b-Quark physics with the LEP collider, *Springer Tracts Mod. Phys.* 236 (2010) 170, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-05279-8>.
- [41] D.J. Jackson, A topological vertex reconstruction algorithm for hadronic jets, *Nucl. Instrum. Methods A* 388 (1997) 247, [http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0168-9002\(97\)00341-0](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0168-9002(97)00341-0).
- [42] LHCb Collaboration, Identification of beauty and charm quark jets at LHCb, *J. Instrum.* 10 (2015) P06013, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1088/1748-0221/10/06/P06013>, arXiv:1504.07670.
- [43] A. Höcker, V. Kartvelishvili, SVD approach to data unfolding, *Nucl. Instrum. Methods A* 372 (1996) 469, [http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/0168-9002\(95\)01478-0](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/0168-9002(95)01478-0), arXiv:hep-ph/9509307.
- [44] T. Adye, Unfolding algorithms and tests using RooUnfold, in: *PHYSTAT 2011 Workshop on Statistical Issues Related to Discovery Claims in Search Experiments and Unfolding*, 2011, p. 313, arXiv:1105.1160.
- [45] A. Aktas, et al., H1, Inclusive production of D^+ , D^0 , D_s^+ , and D^{*+} mesons in deep inelastic scattering at HERA, *Eur. Phys. J. C* 38 (2005) 447, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1140/epjc/s2004-02069-x>, arXiv:hep-ex/0408149.
- [46] CMS Collaboration, Measurement of $B\bar{B}$ angular correlations based on secondary vertex reconstruction at $\sqrt{s} = 7$ TeV, *J. High Energy Phys.* 03 (2011) 136, [http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/JHEP03\(2011\)136](http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/JHEP03(2011)136).
- [47] G. D'Agostini, A multidimensional unfolding method based on Bayes' theorem, *Nucl. Instrum. Methods A* 362 (1994) 487, [http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/0168-9002\(95\)00274-X](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/0168-9002(95)00274-X).
- [48] B. Alver, M. Baker, C. Loizides, P. Steinberg, The PHOBOS Glauber Monte Carlo, arXiv:0805.4411, 2008.
- [49] C. Loizides, J. Nagle, P. Steinberg, Improved version of the PHOBOS Glauber Monte Carlo, *SoftwareX* 1 (2015) 13, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.softx.2015.05.001>, arXiv:1408.2549.

The CMS Collaboration

A.M. Sirunyan, A. Tumasyan

Yerevan Physics Institute, Yerevan, Armenia

W. Adam, E. Asilar, T. Bergauer, J. Brandstetter, E. Brondolin, M. Dragicevic, J. Erö, M. Flechl, M. Friedl, R. Frühwirth¹, V.M. Ghete, C. Hartl, N. Hörmann, J. Hrubec, M. Jeitler¹, A. König, I. Krätschmer, D. Liko, T. Matsushita, I. Mikulec, D. Rabady, N. Rad, B. Rahbaran, H. Rohringer, J. Schieck¹, J. Strauss, W. Waltenberger, C.-E. Wulz¹

Institut für Hochenergiephysik, Wien, Austria

O. Dvornikov, V. Makarenko, V. Zykunov

Institute for Nuclear Problems, Minsk, Belarus

V. Mossolov, N. Shumeiko, J. Suarez Gonzalez

National Centre for Particle and High Energy Physics, Minsk, Belarus

S. Alderweireldt, E.A. De Wolf, X. Janssen, J. Lauwers, M. Van De Klundert, H. Van Haeevermaet, P. Van Mechelen, N. Van Remortel, A. Van Spilbeeck

Universiteit Antwerpen, Antwerpen, Belgium

S. Abu Zeid, F. Blekman, J. D'Hondt, N. Daci, I. De Bruyn, K. Deroover, S. Lowette, S. Moortgat, L. Moreels, A. Olbrechts, Q. Python, S. Tavernier, W. Van Doninck, P. Van Mulders, I. Van Parijs

Vrije Universiteit Brussel, Brussel, Belgium

H. Brun, B. Clerbaux, G. De Lentdecker, H. Delannoy, G. Fasanella, L. Favart, R. Goldouzian, A. Grebenyuk, G. Karapostoli, T. Lenzi, A. Léonard, J. Luetic, T. Maerschalk, A. Marinov, A. Randle-conde, T. Seva, C. Vander Velde, P. Vanlaer, D. Vannerom, R. Yonamine, F. Zenoni, F. Zhang²

Université Libre de Bruxelles, Bruxelles, Belgium

A. Cimmino, T. Cornelis, D. Dobur, A. Fagot, G. Garcia, M. Gul, I. Khvastunov, D. Poyraz, S. Salva, R. Schöfbeck, M. Tytgat, W. Van Driessche, E. Yazgan, N. Zaganidis

Ghent University, Ghent, Belgium

H. Bakhshiansohi, C. Beluffi³, O. Bondu, S. Brochet, G. Bruno, A. Caudron, S. De Visscher, C. Delaere, M. Delcourt, B. Francois, A. Giammanco, A. Jafari, P. Jez, M. Komm, G. Krintiras, V. Lemaitre, A. Magitteri, A. Mertens, M. Musich, C. Nuttens, K. Piotrkowski, L. Quertenmont, M. Selvaggi, M. Vidal Marono, S. Wertz

Université Catholique de Louvain, Louvain-la-Neuve, Belgium

N. Beliy

Université de Mons, Mons, Belgium

W.L. Aldá Júnior, F.L. Alves, G.A. Alves, L. Brito, C. Hensel, A. Moraes, M.E. Pol, P. Rebello Teles

Centro Brasileiro de Pesquisas Físicas, Rio de Janeiro, Brazil

E. Belchior Batista Das Chagas, W. Carvalho, J. Chinellato⁴, A. Custódio, E.M. Da Costa, G.G. Da Silveira⁵, D. De Jesus Damiao, C. De Oliveira Martins, S. Fonseca De Souza, L.M. Huertas Guativa, H. Malbouisson, D. Matos Figueiredo, C. Mora Herrera, L. Mundim, H. Nogima, W.L. Prado Da Silva, A. Santoro, A. Sznajder, E.J. Tonelli Manganote⁴, A. Vilela Pereira

Universidade do Estado do Rio de Janeiro, Rio de Janeiro, Brazil

S. Ahuja^a, C.A. Bernardes^a, S. Dogra^a, T.R. Fernandez Perez Tomei^a, E.M. Gregores^b, P.G. Mercadante^b, C.S. Moon^a, S.F. Novaes^a, Sandra S. Padula^a, D. Romero Abad^b, J.C. Ruiz Vargas^a

^a Universidade Estadual Paulista, São Paulo, Brazil

^b Universidade Federal do ABC, São Paulo, Brazil

A. Aleksandrov, R. Hadjiiska, P. Iaydjiev, M. Rodozov, S. Stoykova, G. Sultanov, M. Vutova

Institute for Nuclear Research and Nuclear Energy, Sofia, Bulgaria

A. Dimitrov, I. Glushkov, L. Litov, B. Pavlov, P. Petkov

University of Sofia, Sofia, Bulgaria

W. Fang⁶

Beihang University, Beijing, China

M. Ahmad, J.G. Bian, G.M. Chen, H.S. Chen, M. Chen, Y. Chen⁷, T. Cheng, C.H. Jiang, D. Leggat, Z. Liu, F. Romeo, S.M. Shaheen, A. Spiezia, J. Tao, C. Wang, Z. Wang, H. Zhang, J. Zhao

Institute of High Energy Physics, Beijing, China

Y. Ban, G. Chen, Q. Li, S. Liu, Y. Mao, S.J. Qian, D. Wang, Z. Xu

State Key Laboratory of Nuclear Physics and Technology, Peking University, Beijing, China

C. Avila, A. Cabrera, L.F. Chaparro Sierra, C. Florez, J.P. Gomez, C.F. González Hernández, J.D. Ruiz Alvarez, J.C. Sanabria

Universidad de Los Andes, Bogota, Colombia

N. Godinovic, D. Lelas, I. Puljak, P.M. Ribeiro Cipriano, T. Sculac

University of Split, Faculty of Electrical Engineering, Mechanical Engineering and Naval Architecture, Split, Croatia

Z. Antunovic, M. Kovac

University of Split, Faculty of Science, Split, Croatia

V. Brigljevic, D. Ferencek, K. Kadija, B. Mesic, S. Micanovic, L. Sudic, T. Susa

Institute Rudjer Boskovic, Zagreb, Croatia

A. Attikis, G. Mavromanolakis, J. Mousa, C. Nicolaou, F. Ptochos, P.A. Razis, H. Rykaczewski, D. Tsiakkouri

University of Cyprus, Nicosia, Cyprus

M. Finger⁸, M. Finger Jr.⁸

Charles University, Prague, Czech Republic

E. Carrera Jarrin

Universidad San Francisco de Quito, Quito, Ecuador

E. El-khateeb⁹, S. Elgammal¹⁰, A. Mohamed¹¹

Academy of Scientific Research and Technology of the Arab Republic of Egypt, Egyptian Network of High Energy Physics, Cairo, Egypt

M. Kadastik, L. Perrini, M. Raidal, A. Tiko, C. Veelken

National Institute of Chemical Physics and Biophysics, Tallinn, Estonia

P. Eerola, J. Pekkanen, M. Voutilainen

Department of Physics, University of Helsinki, Helsinki, Finland

J. Härkönen, T. Järvinen, V. Karimäki, R. Kinnunen, T. Lampén, K. Lassila-Perini, S. Lehti, T. Lindén, P. Luukka, J. Tuominiemi, E. Tuovinen, L. Wendland

Helsinki Institute of Physics, Helsinki, Finland

J. Talvitie, T. Tuuva

Lappeenranta University of Technology, Lappeenranta, Finland

M. Besancon, F. Couderc, M. Dejardin, D. Denegri, B. Fabbro, J.L. Faure, C. Favaro, F. Ferri, S. Ganjour, S. Ghosh, A. Givernaud, P. Gras, G. Hamel de Monchenault, P. Jarry, I. Kucher, E. Locci, M. Mached, J. Malcles, J. Rander, A. Rosowsky, M. Titov, A. Zghiche

IRFU, CEA, Université Paris-Saclay, Gif-sur-Yvette, France

A. Abdulsalam, I. Antropov, S. Baffioni, F. Beaudette, P. Busson, L. Cadamuro, E. Chapon, C. Charlot, O. Davignon, R. Granier de Cassagnac, M. Jo, S. Lisniak, P. Miné, M. Nguyen, C. Ochando, G. Ortona, P. Paganini, P. Pigard, S. Regnard, R. Salerno, Y. Sirois, T. Strebler, Y. Yilmaz, A. Zabi

Laboratoire Leprince-Ringuet, Ecole Polytechnique, IN2P3-CNRS, Palaiseau, France

J.-L. Agram¹², J. Andrea, A. Aubin, D. Bloch, J.-M. Brom, M. Buttignol, E.C. Chabert, N. Chanon, C. Collard, E. Conte¹², X. Coubez, J.-C. Fontaine¹², D. Gelé, U. Goerlach, A.-C. Le Bihan, K. Skovpen, P. Van Hove

Institut Pluridisciplinaire Hubert Curien (IPHC), Université de Strasbourg, CNRS-IN2P3, France

S. Gadrat

Centre de Calcul de l'Institut National de Physique Nucléaire et de Physique des Particules, CNRS/IN2P3, Villeurbanne, France

S. Beauceron, C. Bernet, G. Boudoul, C.A. Carrillo Montoya, R. Chierici, D. Contardo, B. Courbon, P. Depasse, H. El Mamouni, J. Fan, J. Fay, S. Gascon, M. Gouzevitch, G. Grenier, B. Ille, F. Lagarde, I.B. Laktineh, M. Lethuillier, L. Mirabito, A.L. Pequegnot, S. Perries, A. Popov¹³, D. Sabes, V. Sordini, M. Vander Donckt, P. Verdier, S. Viret

Université de Lyon, Université Claude Bernard Lyon 1, CNRS-IN2P3, Institut de Physique Nucléaire de Lyon, Villeurbanne, France

A. Khvedelidze⁸

Georgian Technical University, Tbilisi, Georgia

I. Bagaturia¹⁴

Tbilisi State University, Tbilisi, Georgia

C. Autermann, S. Beranek, L. Feld, A. Heister, M.K. Kiesel, K. Klein, M. Lipinski, A. Ostapchuk, M. Preuten, F. Raupach, S. Schael, C. Schomakers, J. Schulz, T. Verlage, H. Weber, V. Zhukov¹³

RWTH Aachen University, I. Physikalisches Institut, Aachen, Germany

A. Albert, M. Brodski, E. Dietz-Laursonn, D. Duchardt, M. Endres, M. Erdmann, S. Erdweg, T. Esch, R. Fischer, A. Güth, M. Hamer, T. Hebbeker, C. Heidemann, K. Hoepfner, S. Knutzen, M. Merschmeyer, A. Meyer, P. Millet, S. Mukherjee, M. Olschewski, K. Padeken, T. Pook, M. Radziej, H. Reithler, M. Rieger, F. Scheuch, L. Sonnenschein, D. Teyssier, S. Thüer

RWTH Aachen University, III. Physikalisches Institut A, Aachen, Germany

V. Cherepanov, G. Flügge, B. Kargoll, T. Kress, A. Künsken, J. Lingemann, T. Müller, A. Nehr Korn, A. Nowack, C. Pistone, O. Pooth, A. Stahl¹⁵

RWTH Aachen University, III. Physikalisches Institut B, Aachen, Germany

M. Aldaya Martin, T. Arndt, C. Asawatangtrakuldee, K. Beernaert, O. Behnke, U. Behrens, A.A. Bin Anuar, K. Borras¹⁶, A. Campbell, P. Connor, C. Contreras-Campana, F. Costanza, C. Diez Pardos, G. Dolinska, G. Eckerlin, D. Eckstein, T. Eichhorn, E. Eren, E. Gallo¹⁷, J. Garay Garcia, A. Geiser, A. Gizhko, J.M. Grados Luyando, P. Gunnellini, A. Harb, J. Hauk, M. Hempel¹⁸, H. Jung, A. Kalogeropoulos, O. Karacheban¹⁸, M. Kasemann, J. Keaveney, C. Kleinwort, I. Korol, D. Krücker, W. Lange, A. Lelek, J. Leonard, K. Lipka, A. Lobanov, W. Lohmann¹⁸, R. Mankel, I.-A. Melzer-Pellmann, A.B. Meyer, G. Mittag, J. Mnich, A. Mussgiller, E. Ntomari, D. Pitzl, R. Placakyte, A. Raspereza, B. Roland, M.Ö. Sahin, P. Saxena, T. Schoerner-Sadenius, C. Seitz, S. Spannagel, N. Stefaniuk, G.P. Van Onsem, R. Walsh, C. Wissing

Deutsches Elektronen-Synchrotron, Hamburg, Germany

V. Blobel, M. Centis Vignali, A.R. Draeger, T. Dreyer, E. Garutti, D. Gonzalez, J. Haller, M. Hoffmann, A. Junkes, R. Klanner, R. Kogler, N. Kovalchuk, T. Lapsien, T. Lenz, I. Marchesini, D. Marconi, M. Meyer, M. Niedziela, D. Nowatschin, F. Pantaleo¹⁵, T. Peiffer, A. Perieanu, J. Poehlsen, C. Sander, C. Scharf, P. Schleper, A. Schmidt, S. Schumann, J. Schwandt, H. Stadie, G. Steinbrück, F.M. Stober, M. Stöver, H. Tholen, D. Troendle, E. Usai, L. Vanelderden, A. Vanhoefer, B. Vormwald

University of Hamburg, Hamburg, Germany

M. Akbiyik, C. Barth, S. Baur, C. Baus, J. Berger, E. Butz, R. Caspart, T. Chwalek, F. Colombo, W. De Boer, A. Dierlamm, S. Fink, B. Freund, R. Friese, M. Giffels, A. Gilbert, P. Goldenzweig, D. Haitz, F. Hartmann¹⁵, S.M. Heindl, U. Husemann, I. Katkov¹³, S. Kudella, H. Mildner, M.U. Mozer, Th. Müller, M. Plagge, G. Quast, K. Rabbertz, S. Röcker, F. Roscher, M. Schröder, I. Shvetsov, G. Sieber, H.J. Simonis, R. Ulrich, S. Wayand, M. Weber, T. Weiler, S. Williamson, C. Wöhrmann, R. Wolf

Institut für Experimentelle Kernphysik, Karlsruhe, Germany

G. Anagnostou, G. Daskalakis, T. Geralis, V.A. Giakoumopoulou, A. Kyriakis, D. Loukas, I. Topsis-Giotis

Institute of Nuclear and Particle Physics (INPP), NCSR Demokritos, Aghia Paraskevi, Greece

S. Kesisoglou, A. Panagiotou, N. Saoulidou, E. Tziaferi

National and Kapodistrian University of Athens, Athens, Greece

I. Evangelou, G. Flouris, C. Foudas, P. Kokkas, N. Loukas, N. Manthos, I. Papadopoulos, E. Paradas

University of Ioánnina, Ioánnina, Greece

N. Filipovic

MTA-ELTE Lendület CMS Particle and Nuclear Physics Group, Eötvös Loránd University, Budapest, Hungary

G. Bencze, C. Hajdu, D. Horvath¹⁹, F. Sikler, V. Veszpremi, G. Vesztergombi²⁰, A.J. Zsigmond

Wigner Research Centre for Physics, Budapest, Hungary

N. Beni, S. Czellar, J. Karancsi²¹, A. Makovec, J. Molnar, Z. Szillasi

Institute of Nuclear Research ATOMKI, Debrecen, Hungary

M. Bartók²⁰, P. Raics, Z.L. Trocsanyi, B. Ujvari

Institute of Physics, University of Debrecen, Hungary

S. Bahinipati, S. Choudhury²², P. Mal, K. Mandal, A. Nayak²³, D.K. Sahoo, N. Sahoo, S.K. Swain

National Institute of Science Education and Research, Bhubaneswar, India

S. Bansal, S.B. Beri, V. Bhatnagar, R. Chawla, U. Bhawandeep, A.K. Kalsi, A. Kaur, M. Kaur, R. Kumar, P. Kumari, A. Mehta, M. Mittal, J.B. Singh, G. Walia

Panjab University, Chandigarh, India

Ashok Kumar, A. Bhardwaj, B.C. Choudhary, R.B. Garg, S. Keshri, S. Malhotra, M. Naimuddin, N. Nishu, K. Ranjan, R. Sharma, V. Sharma

University of Delhi, Delhi, India

R. Bhattacharya, S. Bhattacharya, K. Chatterjee, S. Dey, S. Dutt, S. Dutta, S. Ghosh, N. Majumdar, A. Modak, K. Mondal, S. Mukhopadhyay, S. Nandan, A. Purohit, A. Roy, D. Roy, S. Roy Chowdhury, S. Sarkar, M. Sharan, S. Thakur

Saha Institute of Nuclear Physics, Kolkata, India

P.K. Behera

Indian Institute of Technology Madras, Madras, India

R. Chudasama, D. Dutta, V. Jha, V. Kumar, A.K. Mohanty¹⁵, P.K. Netrakanti, L.M. Pant, P. Shukla, A. Topkar

Bhabha Atomic Research Centre, Mumbai, India

T. Aziz, S. Dugad, G. Kole, B. Mahakud, S. Mitra, G.B. Mohanty, B. Parida, N. Sur, B. Sutar

Tata Institute of Fundamental Research-A, Mumbai, India

S. Banerjee, S. Bhowmik²⁴, R.K. Dewanjee, S. Ganguly, M. Guchait, Sa. Jain, S. Kumar, M. Maity²⁴, G. Majumder, K. Mazumdar, T. Sarkar²⁴, N. Wickramage²⁵

Tata Institute of Fundamental Research-B, Mumbai, India

S. Chauhan, S. Dube, V. Hegde, A. Kapoor, K. Kothekar, S. Pandey, A. Rane, S. Sharma

Indian Institute of Science Education and Research (IISER), Pune, India

S. Chenarani²⁶, E. Eskandari Tadavani, S.M. Etesami²⁶, A. Fahim²⁷, M. Khakzad, M. Mohammadi Najafabadi, M. Naseri, S. Paktinat Mehdiabadi²⁸, F. Rezaei Hosseinabadi, B. Safarzadeh²⁹, M. Zeinali

Institute for Research in Fundamental Sciences (IPM), Tehran, Iran

M. Felcini, M. Grunewald

University College Dublin, Dublin, Ireland

M. Abbrescia^{a,b}, C. Calabria^{a,b}, C. Caputo^{a,b}, A. Colaleo^a, D. Creanza^{a,c}, L. Cristella^{a,b}, N. De Filippis^{a,c}, M. De Palma^{a,b}, L. Fiore^a, G. Iaselli^{a,c}, G. Maggi^{a,c}, M. Maggi^a, G. Miniello^{a,b}, S. My^{a,b}, S. Nuzzo^{a,b}, A. Pompili^{a,b}, G. Pugliese^{a,c}, R. Radogna^{a,b}, A. Ranieri^a, G. Selvaggi^{a,b}, A. Sharma^a, L. Silvestris^{a,15}, R. Venditti^{a,b}, P. Verwilligen^a

^a INFN Sezione di Bari, Bari, Italy

^b Università di Bari, Bari, Italy

^c Politecnico di Bari, Bari, Italy

G. Abbiendi^a, C. Battilana, D. Bonacorsi^{a,b}, S. Braibant-Giacomelli^{a,b}, L. Brigliadori^{a,b}, R. Campanini^{a,b}, P. Capiluppi^{a,b}, A. Castro^{a,b}, F.R. Cavallo^a, S.S. Chhibra^{a,b}, G. Codispoti^{a,b}, M. Cuffiani^{a,b}, G.M. Dallavalle^a, F. Fabbri^a, A. Fanfani^{a,b}, D. Fasanella^{a,b}, P. Giacomelli^a, C. Grandi^a, L. Guiducci^{a,b}, S. Marcellini^a, G. Masetti^a, A. Montanari^a, F.L. Navarria^{a,b}, A. Perrotta^a, A.M. Rossi^{a,b}, T. Rovelli^{a,b}, G.P. Siroli^{a,b}, N. Tosi^{a,b,15}

^a INFN Sezione di Bologna, Bologna, Italy

^b Università di Bologna, Bologna, Italy

S. Albergo^{a,b}, S. Costa^{a,b}, A. Di Mattia^a, F. Giordano^{a,b}, R. Potenza^{a,b}, A. Tricomi^{a,b}, C. Tuve^{a,b}

^a INFN Sezione di Catania, Catania, Italy

^b Università di Catania, Catania, Italy

G. Barbagli ^a, V. Ciulli ^{a,b}, C. Civinini ^a, R. D'Alessandro ^{a,b}, E. Focardi ^{a,b}, P. Lenzi ^{a,b}, M. Meschini ^a, S. Paoletti ^a, G. Sguazzoni ^a, L. Viliani ^{a,b,15}

^a INFN Sezione di Firenze, Firenze, Italy

^b Università di Firenze, Firenze, Italy

L. Benussi, S. Bianco, F. Fabbri, D. Piccolo, F. Primavera ¹⁵

INFN Laboratori Nazionali di Frascati, Frascati, Italy

V. Calvelli ^{a,b}, F. Ferro ^a, M. Lo Vetere ^{a,b}, M.R. Monge ^{a,b}, E. Robutti ^a, S. Tosi ^{a,b}

^a INFN Sezione di Genova, Genova, Italy

^b Università di Genova, Genova, Italy

L. Brianza ^{a,b,15}, F. Brivio ^{a,b}, M.E. Dinardo ^{a,b}, S. Fiorendi ^{a,b,15}, S. Gennai ^a, A. Ghezzi ^{a,b}, P. Govoni ^{a,b}, M. Malberti ^{a,b}, S. Malvezzi ^a, R.A. Manzoni ^{a,b}, D. Menasce ^a, L. Moroni ^a, M. Paganoni ^{a,b}, D. Pedrini ^a, S. Pigazzini ^{a,b}, S. Ragazzi ^{a,b}, T. Tabarelli de Fatis ^{a,b}

^a INFN Sezione di Milano-Bicocca, Milano, Italy

^b Università di Milano-Bicocca, Milano, Italy

S. Buontempo ^a, N. Cavallo ^{a,c}, G. De Nardo, S. Di Guida ^{a,d,15}, M. Esposito ^{a,b}, F. Fabozzi ^{a,c}, F. Fienga ^{a,b}, A.O.M. Iorio ^{a,b}, G. Lanza ^a, L. Lista ^a, S. Meola ^{a,d,15}, P. Paolucci ^{a,15}, C. Sciacca ^{a,b}, F. Thyssen ^a

^a INFN Sezione di Napoli, Napoli, Italy

^b Università di Napoli 'Federico II', Napoli, Italy

^c Università della Basilicata, Potenza, Italy

^d Università G. Marconi, Roma, Italy

P. Azzi ^{a,15}, N. Bacchetta ^a, L. Benato ^{a,b}, A. Boletti ^{a,b}, R. Carlin ^{a,b}, P. Checchia ^a, M. Dall'Osso ^{a,b}, P. De Castro Manzano ^a, T. Dorigo ^a, U. Dosselli ^a, S. Fantinel ^a, F. Fanzago ^a, F. Gasparini ^{a,b}, U. Gasparini ^{a,b}, A. Gozzelino ^a, S. Lacaprara ^a, M. Margoni ^{a,b}, A.T. Meneguzzo ^{a,b}, F. Montecassiano ^a, J. Pazzini ^{a,b}, N. Pozzobon ^{a,b}, P. Ronchese ^{a,b}, F. Simonetto ^{a,b}, E. Torassa ^a, M. Zanetti ^{a,b}, P. Zotto ^{a,b}

^a INFN Sezione di Padova, Padova, Italy

^b Università di Padova, Padova, Italy

Università di Trento, Trento, Italy

A. Braghieri ^a, A. Magnani ^{a,b}, P. Montagna ^{a,b}, S.P. Ratti ^{a,b}, V. Re ^a, C. Riccardi ^{a,b}, P. Salvini ^a, I. Vai ^{a,b}, P. Vitulo ^{a,b}

^a INFN Sezione di Pavia, Pavia, Italy

^b Università di Pavia, Pavia, Italy

L. Alunni Solestizi ^{a,b}, G.M. Bilei ^a, D. Ciangottini ^{a,b}, L. Fanò ^{a,b}, P. Lariccia ^{a,b}, R. Leonardi ^{a,b}, G. Mantovani ^{a,b}, M. Menichelli ^a, A. Saha ^a, A. Santocchia ^{a,b}

^a INFN Sezione di Perugia, Perugia, Italy

^b Università di Perugia, Perugia, Italy

K. Androsov ^{a,30}, P. Azzurri ^{a,15}, G. Bagliesi ^a, J. Bernardini ^a, T. Boccali ^a, R. Castaldi ^a, M.A. Ciocci ^{a,30}, R. Dell'Orso ^a, S. Donato ^{a,c}, G. Fedi, A. Giassi ^a, M.T. Grippo ^{a,30}, F. Ligabue ^{a,c}, T. Lomtadze ^a, L. Martini ^{a,b}, A. Messineo ^{a,b}, F. Palla ^a, A. Rizzi ^{a,b}, A. Savoy-Navarro ^{a,31}, P. Spagnolo ^a, R. Tenchini ^a, G. Tonelli ^{a,b}, A. Venturi ^a, P.G. Verdini ^a

^a INFN Sezione di Pisa, Pisa, Italy

^b Università di Pisa, Pisa, Italy

^c Scuola Normale Superiore di Pisa, Pisa, Italy

L. Barone ^{a,b}, F. Cavallari ^a, M. Cipriani ^{a,b}, D. Del Re ^{a,b,15}, M. Diemoz ^a, S. Gelli ^{a,b}, E. Longo ^{a,b}, F. Margaroli ^{a,b}, B. Marzocchi ^{a,b}, P. Meridiani ^a, G. Organtini ^{a,b}, R. Paramatti ^a, F. Preiato ^{a,b}, S. Rahatlou ^{a,b}, C. Rovelli ^a, F. Santanastasio ^{a,b}

^a INFN Sezione di Roma, Roma, Italy

^b Università di Roma, Roma, Italy

N. Amapane ^{a,b}, R. Arcidiacono ^{a,c,15}, S. Argiro ^{a,b}, M. Arneodo ^{a,c}, N. Bartosik ^a, R. Bellan ^{a,b}, C. Biino ^a, N. Cartiglia ^a, F. Cenna ^{a,b}, M. Costa ^{a,b}, R. Covarelli ^{a,b}, A. Degano ^{a,b}, N. Demaria ^a, L. Finco ^{a,b}, B. Kiani ^{a,b}, C. Mariotti ^a, S. Maselli ^a, E. Migliore ^{a,b}, V. Monaco ^{a,b}, E. Monteil ^{a,b}, M. Monteno ^a, M.M. Obertino ^{a,b}, L. Pacher ^{a,b}, N. Pastrone ^a, M. Pelliccioni ^a, G.L. Pinna Angioni ^{a,b}, F. Ravera ^{a,b}, A. Romero ^{a,b}, M. Ruspa ^{a,c}, R. Sacchi ^{a,b}, K. Shchelina ^{a,b}, V. Sola ^a, A. Solano ^{a,b}, A. Staiano ^a, P. Traczyk ^{a,b}

^a INFN Sezione di Torino, Torino, Italy

^b Università di Torino, Torino, Italy

^c Università del Piemonte Orientale, Novara, Italy

S. Belforte ^a, M. Casarsa ^a, F. Cossutti ^a, G. Della Ricca ^{a,b}, A. Zanetti ^a

^a INFN Sezione di Trieste, Trieste, Italy

^b Università di Trieste, Trieste, Italy

D.H. Kim, G.N. Kim, M.S. Kim, S. Lee, S.W. Lee, Y.D. Oh, S. Sekmen, D.C. Son, Y.C. Yang

Kyungpook National University, Daegu, Republic of Korea

A. Lee

Chonbuk National University, Jeonju, Republic of Korea

H. Kim

Chonnam National University, Institute for Universe and Elementary Particles, Kwangju, Republic of Korea

J.A. Brochero Cifuentes, T.J. Kim

Hanyang University, Seoul, Republic of Korea

S. Cho, S. Choi, Y. Go, D. Gyun, S. Ha, B. Hong, Y. Jo, Y. Kim, B. Lee, K. Lee, K.S. Lee, S. Lee, J. Lim, S.K. Park, Y. Roh

Korea University, Seoul, Republic of Korea

J. Almond, J. Kim, H. Lee, S.B. Oh, B.C. Radburn-Smith, S.h. Seo, U.K. Yang, H.D. Yoo, G.B. Yu

Seoul National University, Seoul, Republic of Korea

M. Choi, H. Kim, J.H. Kim, J.S.H. Lee, I.C. Park, G. Ryu, M.S. Ryu

University of Seoul, Seoul, Republic of Korea

Y. Choi, J. Goh, C. Hwang, J. Lee, I. Yu

Sungkyunkwan University, Suwon, Republic of Korea

V. Dudenas, A. Juodagalvis, J. Vaitkus

Vilnius University, Vilnius, Lithuania

I. Ahmed, Z.A. Ibrahim, J.R. Komaragiri, M.A.B. Md Ali ³², F. Mohamad Idris ³³, W.A.T. Wan Abdullah, M.N. Yusli, Z. Zolkapli

National Centre for Particle Physics, Universiti Malaya, Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia

H. Castilla-Valdez, E. De La Cruz-Burelo, I. Heredia-De La Cruz ³⁴, A. Hernandez-Almada, R. Lopez-Fernandez, R. Magaña Villalba, J. Mejia Guisao, A. Sanchez-Hernandez

Centro de Investigacion y de Estudios Avanzados del IPN, Mexico City, Mexico

S. Carrillo Moreno, C. Oropeza Barrera, F. Vazquez Valencia

Universidad Iberoamericana, Mexico City, Mexico

S. Carpinteyro, I. Pedraza, H.A. Salazar Ibarguen, C. Uribe Estrada

Benemerita Universidad Autonoma de Puebla, Puebla, Mexico

A. Morelos Pineda

Universidad Autónoma de San Luis Potosí, San Luis Potosí, Mexico

D. Krofcheck

University of Auckland, Auckland, New Zealand

P.H. Butler

University of Canterbury, Christchurch, New Zealand

A. Ahmad, M. Ahmad, Q. Hassan, H.R. Hoorani, W.A. Khan, A. Saddique, M.A. Shah, M. Shoaib, M. Waqas

National Centre for Physics, Quaid-I-Azam University, Islamabad, Pakistan

H. Bialkowska, M. Bluj, B. Boimska, T. Frueboes, M. Górski, M. Kazana, K. Nawrocki,
K. Romanowska-Rybinska, M. Szleper, P. Zalewski

National Centre for Nuclear Research, Swierk, Poland

K. Bunkowski, A. Byszuk³⁵, K. Doroba, A. Kalinowski, M. Konecki, J. Krolikowski, M. Misiura,
M. Olszewski, M. Walczak

Institute of Experimental Physics, Faculty of Physics, University of Warsaw, Warsaw, Poland

P. Bargassa, C. Beirão Da Cruz E Silva, B. Calpas, A. Di Francesco, P. Faccioli, P.G. Ferreira Parracho,
M. Gallinaro, J. Hollar, N. Leonardo, L. Lloret Iglesias, M.V. Nemallapudi, J. Rodrigues Antunes, J. Seixas,
O. Toldaiev, D. Vadrucchio, J. Varela, P. Vischia

Laboratório de Instrumentação e Física Experimental de Partículas, Lisboa, Portugal

S. Afanasiev, P. Bunin, M. Gavrilenko, I. Golutvin, I. Gorbunov, A. Kamenev, V. Karjavin, A. Lanev,
A. Malakhov, V. Matveev^{36,37}, V. Palichik, V. Perelygin, S. Shmatov, S. Shulha, N. Skatchkov, V. Smirnov,
N. Voytishin, A. Zarubin

Joint Institute for Nuclear Research, Dubna, Russia

L. Chtchipounov, V. Golovtsov, Y. Ivanov, V. Kim³⁸, E. Kuznetsova³⁹, V. Murzin, V. Oreshkin, V. Sulimov,
A. Vorobyev

Petersburg Nuclear Physics Institute, Gatchina (St. Petersburg), Russia

Yu. Andreev, A. Dermenev, S. Gninenko, N. Golubev, A. Karneyeu, M. Kirsanov, N. Krasnikov,
A. Pashenkov, D. Tlisov, A. Toropin

Institute for Nuclear Research, Moscow, Russia

V. Epshteyn, V. Gavrilov, N. Lychkovskaya, V. Popov, I. Pozdnyakov, G. Safronov, A. Spiridonov, M. Toms,
E. Vlasov, A. Zhokin

Institute for Theoretical and Experimental Physics, Moscow, Russia

A. Bylinkin³⁷

Moscow Institute of Physics and Technology, Moscow, Russia

R. Chistov⁴⁰, M. Danilov⁴⁰, S. Polikarpov

National Research Nuclear University 'Moscow Engineering Physics Institute' (MEPhI), Moscow, Russia

V. Andreev, M. Azarkin³⁷, I. Dremin³⁷, M. Kirakosyan, A. Leonidov³⁷, A. Terkulov

P.N. Lebedev Physical Institute, Moscow, Russia

A. Baskakov, A. Belyaev, E. Boos, A. Demiyanov, A. Ershov, A. Gribushin, O. Kodolova, V. Korotkikh, I. Lokhtin, I. Miagkov, S. Obraztsov, S. Petrushanko, V. Savrin, A. Snigirev, I. Vardanyan

Skobeltsyn Institute of Nuclear Physics, Lomonosov Moscow State University, Moscow, Russia

V. Blinov⁴¹, Y. Skovpen⁴¹, D. Shtol⁴¹

Novosibirsk State University (NSU), Novosibirsk, Russia

I. Azhgirey, I. Bayshev, S. Bitioukov, D. Elumakhov, V. Kachanov, A. Kalinin, D. Konstantinov, V. Krychkin, V. Petrov, R. Ryutin, A. Sobol, S. Troshin, N. Tyurin, A. Uzunian, A. Volkov

State Research Center of Russian Federation, Institute for High Energy Physics, Protvino, Russia

P. Adzic⁴², P. Cirkovic, D. Devetak, M. Dordevic, J. Milosevic, V. Rekovic

University of Belgrade, Faculty of Physics and Vinca Institute of Nuclear Sciences, Belgrade, Serbia

J. Alcaraz Maestre, M. Barrio Luna, E. Calvo, M. Cerrada, M. Chamizo Llatas, N. Colino, B. De La Cruz, A. Delgado Peris, A. Escalante Del Valle, C. Fernandez Bedoya, J.P. Fernández Ramos, J. Flix, M.C. Fouz, P. Garcia-Abia, O. Gonzalez Lopez, S. Goy Lopez, J.M. Hernandez, M.I. Josa, E. Navarro De Martino, A. Pérez-Calero Yzquierdo, J. Puerta Pelayo, A. Quintario Olmeda, I. Redondo, L. Romero, M.S. Soares

Centro de Investigaciones Energéticas Medioambientales y Tecnológicas (CIEMAT), Madrid, Spain

J.F. de Trocóniz, M. Missiroli, D. Moran

Universidad Autónoma de Madrid, Madrid, Spain

J. Cuevas, J. Fernandez Menendez, I. Gonzalez Caballero, J.R. González Fernández, E. Palencia Cortezon, S. Sanchez Cruz, I. Suárez Andrés, J.M. Vizan Garcia

Universidad de Oviedo, Oviedo, Spain

I.J. Cabrillo, A. Calderon, J.R. Castiñeiras De Saa, E. Curras, M. Fernandez, J. Garcia-Ferrero, G. Gomez, A. Lopez Virto, J. Marco, C. Martinez Rivero, F. Matorras, J. Piedra Gomez, T. Rodrigo, A. Ruiz-Jimeno, L. Scodellaro, N. Trevisani, I. Vila, R. Vilar Cortabitarte

Instituto de Física de Cantabria (IFCA), CSIC-Universidad de Cantabria, Santander, Spain

D. Abbaneo, E. Auffray, G. Auzinger, M. Bachtis, P. Baillon, A.H. Ball, D. Barney, P. Bloch, A. Bocci, A. Bonato, C. Botta, T. Camporesi, R. Castello, M. Cepeda, G. Cerminara, M. D'Alfonso, D. d'Enterria, A. Dabrowski, V. Daponte, A. David, M. De Gruttola, A. De Roeck, E. Di Marco⁴³, M. Dobson, B. Dorney, T. du Pree, D. Duggan, M. Dünser, N. Dupont, A. Elliott-Peisert, S. Fartoukh, G. Franzoni, J. Fulcher, W. Funk, D. Gigi, K. Gill, M. Girone, F. Glege, D. Gulhan, S. Gundacker, M. Guthoff, J. Hammer, P. Harris, J. Hegeman, V. Innocente, P. Janot, J. Kieseler, H. Kirschenmann, V. Knünz, A. Kornmayer¹⁵, M.J. Kortelainen, K. Kousouris, M. Krammer¹, C. Lange, P. Lecoq, C. Lourenço, M.T. Lucchini, L. Malgeri, M. Mannelli, A. Martelli, F. Meijers, J.A. Merlin, S. Mersi, E. Meschi, P. Milenovic⁴⁴, F. Moortgat, S. Morovic, M. Mulders, H. Neugebauer, S. Orfanelli, L. Orsini, L. Pape, E. Perez, M. Peruzzi, A. Petrilli, G. Petrucciani, A. Pfeiffer, M. Pierini, A. Racz, T. Reis, G. Rolandi⁴⁵, M. Rovere, M. Ruan, H. Sakulin, J.B. Sauvan, C. Schäfer, C. Schwick, M. Seidel, A. Sharma, P. Silva, P. Sphicas⁴⁶, J. Steggemann, M. Stoye, Y. Takahashi, M. Tosi, D. Treille, A. Triossi, A. Tsiros, V. Veckalns⁴⁷, G.I. Veres²⁰, M. Verweij, N. Wardle, H.K. Wöhri, A. Zagozdinska³⁵, W.D. Zeuner

CERN, European Organization for Nuclear Research, Geneva, Switzerland

W. Bertl, K. Deiters, W. Erdmann, R. Horisberger, Q. Ingram, H.C. Kaestli, D. Kotlinski, U. Langenegger, T. Rohe

Paul Scherrer Institut, Villigen, Switzerland

F. Bachmair, L. Bäni, L. Bianchini, B. Casal, G. Dissertori, M. Dittmar, M. Donegà, C. Grab, C. Heidegger, D. Hits, J. Hoss, G. Kasieczka, P. Lecomte[†], W. Lustermann, B. Mangano, M. Marionneau, P. Martinez Ruiz del Arbol, M. Masciovecchio, M.T. Meinhard, D. Meister, F. Micheli, P. Musella, F. Nessi-Tedaldi, F. Pandolfi, J. Pata, F. Pauss, G. Perrin, L. Perrozzi, M. Quittnat, M. Rossini, M. Schönenberger, A. Starodumov⁴⁸, V.R. Tavolaro, K. Theofilatos, R. Wallny

Institute for Particle Physics, ETH Zurich, Zurich, Switzerland

T.K. Aarrestad, C. AMSler⁴⁹, L. Caminada, M.F. Canelli, A. De Cosa, C. Galloni, A. Hinzmann, T. Hreus, B. Kilminster, J. Ngadiuba, D. Pinna, G. Rauco, P. Robmann, D. Salerno, Y. Yang, A. Zucchetta

Universität Zürich, Zurich, Switzerland

V. Candelise, T.H. Doan, Sh. Jain, R. Khurana, M. Konyushikhin, C.M. Kuo, W. Lin, Y.J. Lu, A. Pozdnyakov, S.S. Yu

National Central University, Chung-Li, Taiwan

Arun Kumar, P. Chang, Y.H. Chang, Y.W. Chang, Y. Chao, K.F. Chen, P.H. Chen, C. Dietz, F. Fiori, W.-S. Hou, Y. Hsiung, Y.F. Liu, R.-S. Lu, M. Miñano Moya, E. Paganis, A. Psallidas, J.f. Tsai, Y.M. Tzeng

National Taiwan University (NTU), Taipei, Taiwan

B. Asavapibhop, G. Singh, N. Srimanobhas, N. Suwonjandee

Chulalongkorn University, Faculty of Science, Department of Physics, Bangkok, Thailand

A. Adiguzel, M.N. Bakirci⁵⁰, S. Damarseckin, Z.S. Demiroglu, C. Dozen, E. Eskut, S. Girgis, G. Gokbulut, Y. Guler, I. Hos⁵¹, E.E. Kangal⁵², O. Kara, U. Kiminsu, M. Oglakci, G. Onengut⁵³, K. Ozdemir⁵⁴, S. Ozturk⁵⁰, A. Polatoz, D. Sunar Cerci⁵⁵, S. Turkcapar, I.S. Zorbakir, C. Zorbilmez

Cukurova University - Physics Department, Science and Art Faculty, Turkey

B. Bilin, S. Bilmis, B. Isildak⁵⁶, G. Karapinar⁵⁷, M. Yalvac, M. Zeyrek

Middle East Technical University, Physics Department, Ankara, Turkey

E. Gülmez, M. Kaya⁵⁸, O. Kaya⁵⁹, E.A. Yetkin⁶⁰, T. Yetkin⁶¹

Bogazici University, Istanbul, Turkey

A. Cakir, K. Cankocak, S. Sen⁶²

Istanbul Technical University, Istanbul, Turkey

B. Grynyov

Institute for Scintillation Materials of National Academy of Science of Ukraine, Kharkov, Ukraine

L. Levchuk, P. Sorokin

National Scientific Center, Kharkov Institute of Physics and Technology, Kharkov, Ukraine

R. Aggleton, F. Ball, L. Beck, J.J. Brooke, D. Burns, E. Clement, D. Cussans, H. Flacher, J. Goldstein, M. Grimes, G.P. Heath, H.F. Heath, J. Jacob, L. Kreczko, C. Lucas, D.M. Newbold⁶³, S. Paramesvaran, A. Poll, T. Sakuma, S. Seif El Nasr-storey, D. Smith, V.J. Smith

University of Bristol, Bristol, United Kingdom

A. Belyaev⁶⁴, C. Brew, R.M. Brown, L. Calligaris, D. Cieri, D.J.A. Cockerill, J.A. Coughlan, K. Harder, S. Harper, E. Olaiya, D. Petyt, C.H. Shepherd-Themistocleous, A. Thea, I.R. Tomalin, T. Williams

Rutherford Appleton Laboratory, Didcot, United Kingdom

M. Baber, R. Bainbridge, O. Buchmuller, A. Bundock, D. Burton, S. Casasso, M. Citron, D. Colling, L. Corpe, P. Dauncey, G. Davies, A. De Wit, M. Della Negra, R. Di Maria, P. Dunne, A. Elwood, D. Futyan, Y. Haddad, G. Hall, G. Iles, T. James, R. Lane, C. Laner, R. Lucas⁶³, L. Lyons, A.-M. Magnan, S. Malik, L. Mastrolorenzo, J. Nash, A. Nikitenko⁴⁸, J. Pela, B. Penning, M. Pesaresi, D.M. Raymond, A. Richards, A. Rose, C. Seez, S. Summers, A. Tapper, K. Uchida, M. Vazquez Acosta⁶⁵, T. Virdee¹⁵, J. Wright, S.C. Zenz

Imperial College, London, United Kingdom

J.E. Cole, P.R. Hobson, A. Khan, P. Kyberd, D. Leslie, I.D. Reid, P. Symonds, L. Teodorescu, M. Turner

Brunel University, Uxbridge, United Kingdom

A. Borzou, K. Call, J. Dittmann, K. Hatakeyama, H. Liu, N. Pastika

Baylor University, Waco, USA

S.I. Cooper, C. Henderson, P. Rumerio, C. West

The University of Alabama, Tuscaloosa, USA

D. Arcaro, A. Avetisyan, T. Bose, D. Gastler, D. Rankin, C. Richardson, J. Rohlf, L. Sulak, D. Zou

Boston University, Boston, USA

G. Benelli, E. Berry, D. Cutts, A. Garabedian, J. Hakala, U. Heintz, J.M. Hogan, O. Jesus, K.H.M. Kwok, E. Laird, G. Landsberg, Z. Mao, M. Narain, S. Piperov, S. Sagir, E. Spencer, R. Syarif

Brown University, Providence, USA

R. Breedon, G. Breto, D. Burns, M. Calderon De La Barca Sanchez, S. Chauhan, M. Chertok, J. Conway, R. Conway, P.T. Cox, R. Erbacher, C. Flores, G. Funk, M. Gardner, W. Ko, R. Lander, C. Mclean, M. Mulhearn, D. Pellett, J. Pilot, S. Shalhout, J. Smith, M. Squires, D. Stolp, M. Tripathi

University of California, Davis, Davis, USA

C. Bravo, R. Cousins, A. Dasgupta, P. Everaerts, A. Florent, J. Hauser, M. Ignatenko, N. Mccoll, D. Saltzberg, C. Schnaible, E. Takasugi, V. Valuev, M. Weber

University of California, Los Angeles, USA

E. Bouvier, K. Burt, R. Clare, J. Ellison, J.W. Gary, S.M.A. Ghiasi Shirazi, G. Hanson, J. Heilman, P. Jandir, E. Kennedy, F. Lacroix, O.R. Long, M. Olmedo Negrete, M.I. Paneva, A. Shrinivas, W. Si, H. Wei, S. Wimpenny, B.R. Yates

University of California, Riverside, Riverside, USA

J.G. Branson, G.B. Cerati, S. Cittolin, M. Derdzinski, R. Gerosa, A. Holzner, D. Klein, V. Krutelyov, J. Letts, I. Macneill, D. Olivito, S. Padhi, M. Pieri, M. Sani, V. Sharma, S. Simon, M. Tadel, A. Vartak, S. Wasserbaech⁶⁶, C. Welke, J. Wood, F. Würthwein, A. Yagil, G. Zevi Della Porta

University of California, San Diego, La Jolla, USA

N. Amin, R. Bhandari, J. Bradmiller-Feld, C. Campagnari, A. Dishaw, V. Dutta, M. Franco Sevilla, C. George, F. Golf, L. Gouskos, J. Gran, R. Heller, J. Incandela, S.D. Mullin, A. Ovcharova, H. Qu, J. Richman, D. Stuart, I. Suarez, J. Yoo

University of California, Santa Barbara - Department of Physics, Santa Barbara, USA

D. Anderson, J. Bendavid, A. Bornheim, J. Bunn, Y. Chen, J. Duarte, J.M. Lawhorn, A. Mott, H.B. Newman, C. Pena, M. Spiropulu, J.R. Vlimant, S. Xie, R.Y. Zhu

California Institute of Technology, Pasadena, USA

M.B. Andrews, T. Ferguson, M. Paulini, J. Russ, M. Sun, H. Vogel, I. Vorobiev, M. Weinberg

Carnegie Mellon University, Pittsburgh, USA

J.P. Cumalat, W.T. Ford, F. Jensen, A. Johnson, M. Krohn, T. Mulholland, K. Stenson, S.R. Wagner

University of Colorado Boulder, Boulder, USA

J. Alexander, J. Chaves, J. Chu, S. Dittmer, K. Mcdermott, N. Mirman, G. Nicolas Kaufman, J.R. Patterson, A. Rinkevicius, A. Ryd, L. Skinnari, L. Soffi, S.M. Tan, Z. Tao, J. Thom, J. Tucker, P. Wittich, M. Zientek

Cornell University, Ithaca, USA

D. Winn

Fairfield University, Fairfield, USA

S. Abdullin, M. Albrow, G. Apollinari, A. Apresyan, S. Banerjee, L.A.T. Bauerdick, A. Beretvas, J. Berryhill, P.C. Bhat, G. Bolla, K. Burkett, J.N. Butler, H.W.K. Cheung, F. Chlebana, S. Cihangir[†], M. Cremonesi, V.D. Elvira, I. Fisk, J. Freeman, E. Gottschalk, L. Gray, D. Green, S. Grünendahl, O. Gutsche, D. Hare, R.M. Harris, S. Hasegawa, J. Hirschauer, Z. Hu, B. Jayatilaka, S. Jindariani, M. Johnson, U. Joshi, B. Klima, B. Kreis, S. Lammel, J. Linacre, D. Lincoln, R. Lipton, M. Liu, T. Liu, R. Lopes De Sá, J. Lykken, K. Maeshima, N. Magini, J.M. Marraffino, S. Maruyama, D. Mason, P. McBride, P. Merkel, S. Mrenna, S. Nahn, V. O'Dell, K. Pedro, O. Prokofyev, G. Rakness, L. Ristori, E. Sexton-Kennedy, A. Soha, W.J. Spalding, L. Spiegel, S. Stoynev, J. Strait, N. Strobbe, L. Taylor, S. Tkaczyk, N.V. Tran, L. Uplegger, E.W. Vaandering, C. Vernieri, M. Verzocchi, R. Vidal, M. Wang, H.A. Weber, A. Whitbeck, Y. Wu

Fermi National Accelerator Laboratory, Batavia, USA

D. Acosta, P. Avery, P. Bortignon, D. Bourilkov, A. Brinkerhoff, A. Carnes, M. Carver, D. Curry, S. Das, R.D. Field, I.K. Furic, J. Konigsberg, A. Korytov, J.F. Low, P. Ma, K. Matchev, H. Mei, G. Mitselmakher, D. Rank, L. Shchutska, D. Sperka, L. Thomas, J. Wang, S. Wang, J. Yelton

University of Florida, Gainesville, USA

S. Linn, P. Markowitz, G. Martinez, J.L. Rodriguez

Florida International University, Miami, USA

A. Ackert, J.R. Adams, T. Adams, A. Askew, S. Bein, B. Diamond, S. Hagopian, V. Hagopian, K.F. Johnson, H. Prosper, A. Santra, R. Yohay

Florida State University, Tallahassee, USA

M.M. Baarmand, V. Bhopatkar, S. Colafranceschi, M. Hohlmann, D. Noonan, T. Roy, F. Yumiceva

Florida Institute of Technology, Melbourne, USA

M.R. Adams, L. Apanasevich, D. Berry, R.R. Betts, I. Bucinskaite, R. Cavanaugh, O. Evdokimov, L. Gauthier, C.E. Gerber, D.J. Hofman, K. Jung, P. Kurt, C. O'Brien, I.D. Sandoval Gonzalez, P. Turner, N. Varelas, H. Wang, Z. Wu, M. Zakaria, J. Zhang

University of Illinois at Chicago (UIC), Chicago, USA

B. Bilki⁶⁷, W. Clarida, K. Dilsiz, S. Durgut, R.P. Gandrajula, M. Haytmyradov, V. Khristenko, J.-P. Merlo, H. Mermerkaya⁶⁸, A. Mestvirishvili, A. Moeller, J. Nachtman, H. Ogul, Y. Onel, F. Ozok⁶⁹, A. Penzo, C. Snyder, E. Tiras, J. Wetzel, K. Yi

The University of Iowa, Iowa City, USA

I. Anderson, B. Blumenfeld, A. Cocoros, N. Eminizer, D. Fehling, L. Feng, A.V. Gritsan, P. Maksimovic, C. Martin, M. Osherson, J. Roskes, U. Sarica, M. Swartz, M. Xiao, Y. Xin, C. You

Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, USA

A. Al-bataineh, P. Baringer, A. Bean, S. Boren, J. Bowen, C. Bruner, J. Castle, L. Forthomme, R.P. Kenny III, S. Khalil, A. Kropivnitskaya, D. Majumder, W. Mcbrayer, M. Murray, S. Sanders, R. Stringer, J.D. Tapia Takaki, Q. Wang

The University of Kansas, Lawrence, USA

A. Ivanov, K. Kaadze, Y. Maravin, A. Mohammadi, L.K. Saini, N. Skhirtladze, S. Toda

Kansas State University, Manhattan, USA

F. Rebassoo, D. Wright

Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory, Livermore, USA

C. Anelli, A. Baden, O. Baron, A. Belloni, B. Calvert, S.C. Eno, C. Ferraioli, J.A. Gomez, N.J. Hadley, S. Jabeen, R.G. Kellogg, T. Kolberg, J. Kunkle, Y. Lu, A.C. Mignerey, F. Ricci-Tam, Y.H. Shin, A. Skuja, M.B. Tonjes, S.C. Tonwar

University of Maryland, College Park, USA

D. Abercrombie, B. Allen, A. Apyan, V. Azzolini, R. Barbieri, A. Baty, R. Bi, K. Bierwagen, S. Brandt, W. Busza, I.A. Cali, Z. Demiragli, L. Di Matteo, G. Gomez Ceballos, M. Goncharov, D. Hsu, Y. Iiyama, G.M. Innocenti, M. Klute, D. Kovalskyi, K. Krajczar, Y.S. Lai, Y.-J. Lee, A. Levin, P.D. Luckey, B. Maier, A.C. Marini, C. Mcginn, C. Mironov, S. Narayanan, X. Niu, C. Paus, C. Roland, G. Roland, J. Salfeld-Nebgen, G.S.F. Stephans, K. Tatar, M. Varma, D. Velicanu, J. Veverka, J. Wang, T.W. Wang, B. Wyslouch, M. Yang, V. Zhukova

Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge, USA

A.C. Benvenuti, R.M. Chatterjee, A. Evans, A. Finkel, A. Gude, P. Hansen, S. Kalafut, S.C. Kao, Y. Kubota, Z. Lesko, J. Mans, S. Nourbakhsh, N. Ruckstuhl, R. Rusack, N. Tambe, J. Turkewitz

University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, USA

J.G. Acosta, S. Oliveros

University of Mississippi, Oxford, USA

E. Avdeeva, R. Bartek⁷⁰, K. Bloom, D.R. Claes, A. Dominguez⁷⁰, C. Fangmeier, R. Gonzalez Suarez, R. Kamalieddin, I. Kravchenko, A. Malta Rodrigues, F. Meier, J. Monroy, J.E. Siado, G.R. Snow, B. Stieger

University of Nebraska-Lincoln, Lincoln, USA

M. Alyari, J. Dolen, J. George, A. Godshalk, C. Harrington, I. Iashvili, J. Kaisen, A. Kharchilava, A. Kumar, A. Parker, S. Rappoccio, B. Roozbahani

State University of New York at Buffalo, Buffalo, USA

G. Alverson, E. Barberis, A. Hortiangtham, A. Massironi, D.M. Morse, D. Nash, T. Orimoto, R. Teixeira De Lima, D. Trocino, R.-J. Wang, D. Wood

Northeastern University, Boston, USA

S. Bhattacharya, O. Charaf, K.A. Hahn, A. Kubik, A. Kumar, N. Mucia, N. Odell, B. Pollack, M.H. Schmitt, K. Sung, M. Trovato, M. Velasco

Northwestern University, Evanston, USA

N. Dev, M. Hildreth, K. Hurtado Anampa, C. Jessop, D.J. Karmgard, N. Kellams, K. Lannon, N. Marinelli, F. Meng, C. Mueller, Y. Musienko³⁶, M. Planer, A. Reinsvold, R. Ruchti, G. Smith, S. Taroni, M. Wayne, M. Wolf, A. Woodard

University of Notre Dame, Notre Dame, USA

J. Alimena, L. Antonelli, B. Bylsma, L.S. Durkin, S. Flowers, B. Francis, A. Hart, C. Hill, R. Hughes, W. Ji, B. Liu, W. Luo, D. Puigh, B.L. Winer, H.W. Wulsin

The Ohio State University, Columbus, USA

S. Cooperstein, O. Driga, P. Elmer, J. Hardenbrook, P. Hebda, D. Lange, J. Luo, D. Marlow, T. Medvedeva, K. Mei, M. Mooney, J. Olsen, C. Palmer, P. Piroué, D. Stickland, A. Svyatkovskiy, C. Tully, A. Zuranski

Princeton University, Princeton, USA

S. Malik

University of Puerto Rico, Mayaguez, USA

A. Barker, V.E. Barnes, S. Folgueras, L. Gutay, M.K. Jha, M. Jones, A.W. Jung, A. Khatiwada, D.H. Miller, N. Neumeister, J.F. Schulte, X. Shi, J. Sun, F. Wang, W. Xie

Purdue University, West Lafayette, USA

N. Parashar, J. Stupak

Purdue University Calumet, Hammond, USA

A. Adair, B. Akgun, Z. Chen, K.M. Ecklund, F.J.M. Geurts, M. Guilbaud, W. Li, B. Michlin, M. Northup, B.P. Padley, R. Redjimi, J. Roberts, J. Rorie, Z. Tu, J. Zabel

Rice University, Houston, USA

B. Betchart, A. Bodek, P. de Barbaro, R. Demina, Y.t. Duh, T. Ferbel, M. Galanti, A. Garcia-Bellido, J. Han, O. Hindrichs, A. Khukhunaishvili, K.H. Lo, P. Tan, M. Verzetti

University of Rochester, Rochester, USA

A. Agapitos, J.P. Chou, E. Contreras-Campana, Y. Gershtein, T.A. Gómez Espinosa, E. Halkiadakis, M. Heindl, D. Hidas, E. Hughes, S. Kaplan, R. Kunnawalkam Elayavalli, S. Kyriacou, A. Lath, K. Nash, H. Saka, S. Salur, S. Schnetzer, D. Sheffield, S. Somalwar, R. Stone, S. Thomas, P. Thomassen, M. Walker

Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey, Piscataway, USA

A.G. Delannoy, M. Foerster, J. Heideman, G. Riley, K. Rose, S. Spanier, K. Thapa

University of Tennessee, Knoxville, USA

O. Bouhali⁷¹, A. Celik, M. Dalchenko, M. De Mattia, A. Delgado, S. Dildick, R. Eusebi, J. Gilmore, T. Huang, E. Juska, T. Kamon⁷², R. Mueller, Y. Pakhotin, R. Patel, A. Perloff, L. Perniè, D. Rathjens, A. Rose, A. Safonov, A. Tatarinov, K.A. Ulmer

Texas A&M University, College Station, USA

N. Akchurin, C. Cowden, J. Damgov, F. De Guio, C. Dragoiu, P.R. Duderu, J. Faulkner, E. Gurpinar, S. Kunori, K. Lamichhane, S.W. Lee, T. Libeiro, T. Peltola, S. Undleeb, I. Volobouev, Z. Wang

Texas Tech University, Lubbock, USA

S. Greene, A. Gurrola, R. Janjam, W. Johns, C. Maguire, A. Melo, H. Ni, P. Sheldon, S. Tuo, J. Velkovska, Q. Xu

Vanderbilt University, Nashville, USA

M.W. Arenton, P. Barria, B. Cox, J. Goodell, R. Hirosky, A. Ledovskoy, H. Li, C. Neu, T. Sinthuprasith, X. Sun, Y. Wang, E. Wolfe, F. Xia

University of Virginia, Charlottesville, USA

C. Clarke, R. Harr, P.E. Karchin, J. Sturdy

Wayne State University, Detroit, USA

D.A. Belknap, J. Buchanan, C. Caillol, S. Dasu, L. Dodd, S. Duric, B. Gomber, M. Grothe, M. Herndon, A. Hervé, P. Klabbers, A. Lanaro, A. Levine, K. Long, R. Loveless, I. Ojalvo, T. Perry, G.A. Pierro, G. Polese, T. Ruggles, A. Savin, N. Smith, W.H. Smith, D. Taylor, N. Woods

University of Wisconsin–Madison, Madison, WI, USA

[†] Deceased.

¹ Also at Vienna University of Technology, Vienna, Austria.

² Also at State Key Laboratory of Nuclear Physics and Technology, Peking University, Beijing, China.

³ Also at Institut Pluridisciplinaire Hubert Curien (IPHC), Université de Strasbourg, CNRS/IN2P3, Strasbourg, France.

⁴ Also at Universidade Estadual de Campinas, Campinas, Brazil.

⁵ Also at Universidade Federal de Pelotas, Pelotas, Brazil.

⁶ Also at Université Libre de Bruxelles, Bruxelles, Belgium.

⁷ Also at Deutsches Elektronen-Synchrotron, Hamburg, Germany.

⁸ Also at Joint Institute for Nuclear Research, Dubna, Russia.

⁹ Now at Ain Shams University, Cairo, Egypt.

¹⁰ Now at British University in Egypt, Cairo, Egypt.

¹¹ Also at Zewail City of Science and Technology, Zewail, Egypt.

¹² Also at Université de Haute Alsace, Mulhouse, France.

¹³ Also at Skobeltsyn Institute of Nuclear Physics, Lomonosov Moscow State University, Moscow, Russia.

¹⁴ Also at Ilia State University, Tbilisi, Georgia.

¹⁵ Also at CERN, European Organization for Nuclear Research, Geneva, Switzerland.

¹⁶ Also at RWTH Aachen University, III. Physikalisches Institut A, Aachen, Germany.

¹⁷ Also at University of Hamburg, Hamburg, Germany.

¹⁸ Also at Brandenburg University of Technology, Cottbus, Germany.

¹⁹ Also at Institute of Nuclear Research ATOMKI, Debrecen, Hungary.

²⁰ Also at MTA-ELTE Lendület CMS Particle and Nuclear Physics Group, Eötvös Loránd University, Budapest, Hungary.

²¹ Also at Institute of Physics, University of Debrecen, Debrecen, Hungary.

²² Also at Indian Institute of Science Education and Research, Bhopal, India.

²³ Also at Institute of Physics, Bhubaneswar, India.

²⁴ Also at University of Visva-Bharati, Santiniketan, India.

²⁵ Also at University of Ruhuna, Matara, Sri Lanka.

²⁶ Also at Isfahan University of Technology, Isfahan, Iran.

²⁷ Also at University of Tehran, Department of Engineering Science, Tehran, Iran.

²⁸ Also at Yazd University, Yazd, Iran.

²⁹ Also at Plasma Physics Research Center, Science and Research Branch, Islamic Azad University, Tehran, Iran.

³⁰ Also at Università degli Studi di Siena, Siena, Italy.

³¹ Also at Purdue University, West Lafayette, USA.

³² Also at International Islamic University of Malaysia, Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia.

³³ Also at Malaysian Nuclear Agency, MOSTI, Kajang, Malaysia.

³⁴ Also at Consejo Nacional de Ciencia y Tecnología, Mexico city, Mexico.

³⁵ Also at Warsaw University of Technology, Institute of Electronic Systems, Warsaw, Poland.

³⁶ Also at Institute for Nuclear Research, Moscow, Russia.

³⁷ Now at National Research Nuclear University 'Moscow Engineering Physics Institute' (MEPhI), Moscow, Russia.

³⁸ Also at St. Petersburg State Polytechnical University, St. Petersburg, Russia.

³⁹ Also at University of Florida, Gainesville, USA.

⁴⁰ Also at P.N. Lebedev Physical Institute, Moscow, Russia.

⁴¹ Also at Budker Institute of Nuclear Physics, Novosibirsk, Russia.

⁴² Also at Faculty of Physics, University of Belgrade, Belgrade, Serbia.

⁴³ Also at INFN Sezione di Roma; Università di Roma, Roma, Italy.

⁴⁴ Also at University of Belgrade, Faculty of Physics and Vinca Institute of Nuclear Sciences, Belgrade, Serbia.

⁴⁵ Also at Scuola Normale e Sezione dell'INFN, Pisa, Italy.

⁴⁶ Also at National and Kapodistrian University of Athens, Athens, Greece.

⁴⁷ Also at Riga Technical University, Riga, Latvia.

- 48 Also at Institute for Theoretical and Experimental Physics, Moscow, Russia.
- 49 Also at Albert Einstein Center for Fundamental Physics, Bern, Switzerland.
- 50 Also at Gaziosmanpasa University, Tokat, Turkey.
- 51 Also at Istanbul Aydin University, Istanbul, Turkey.
- 52 Also at Mersin University, Mersin, Turkey.
- 53 Also at Cag University, Mersin, Turkey.
- 54 Also at Piri Reis University, Istanbul, Turkey.
- 55 Also at Adiyaman University, Adiyaman, Turkey.
- 56 Also at Ozyegin University, Istanbul, Turkey.
- 57 Also at Izmir Institute of Technology, Izmir, Turkey.
- 58 Also at Marmara University, Istanbul, Turkey.
- 59 Also at Kafkas University, Kars, Turkey.
- 60 Also at Istanbul Bilgi University, Istanbul, Turkey.
- 61 Also at Yildiz Technical University, Istanbul, Turkey.
- 62 Also at Hacettepe University, Ankara, Turkey.
- 63 Also at Rutherford Appleton Laboratory, Didcot, United Kingdom.
- 64 Also at School of Physics and Astronomy, University of Southampton, Southampton, United Kingdom.
- 65 Also at Instituto de Astrofísica de Canarias, La Laguna, Spain.
- 66 Also at Utah Valley University, Orem, USA.
- 67 Also at Argonne National Laboratory, Argonne, USA.
- 68 Also at Erzincan University, Erzincan, Turkey.
- 69 Also at Mimar Sinan University, Istanbul, Istanbul, Turkey.
- 70 Now at The Catholic University of America, Washington, USA.
- 71 Also at Texas A&M University at Qatar, Doha, Qatar.
- 72 Also at Kyungpook National University, Daegu, Republic of Korea.